UNITED
NATIONS

TD

United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development

Distr.
GENERAL

TD/B/C.5/127
19 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Special Committee on Preferences
Seventeenth session
Geneva, 14 May 1990
Item 2 of the provisional agenda

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Provisional agenda and annotations to the provisional agenda

Note by the UNCTAD secretariat

I. PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Election of officers

2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

3. Comprehensive review of the generalized system of preferences, including its implementation, maintenance, improvement and utilization

4. Harmonization and improvement of the rules of origin

5. Technical assistance in connection with the generalized system of preferences

6. Provisional agenda for the eighteenth session of the Special Committee on Preferences

7. Other business

8. Adoption of the report of the Special Committee on Preferences to the Trade and Development Board

GE.90-50784/3155a

best copy available

II. ANNOTATIONS TO THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Introduction

By its resolution 77 (III), the Conference decided to establish the Special Committee on Preferences as a permanent mechanism within UNCTAD. Its terms of reference are described in section VIII of the agreed conclusions adopted by the Special Committee at its fourth session. Accordingly, at its seventeenth session the Committee will, inter alia, carry out the periodic review of the generalized system of preferences.

Item 1: Election of officers

At its fifth session, the Committee decided to apply the seven-session cycle of rotation (like that annexed to the rules of procedure of the Committee on Manufactures) and to elect a chairman and a rapporteur for that session as in accordance with the second year of the cycle. It agreed that the election of the chairman and rapporteurs who had held office during the period before its change of status (i.e. during the first four sessions) would be considered as being in application of the first year of the cycle. 1/ Accordingly, the seventeenth session corresponds to the last session of a seven-session cycle, and the chairman of the seventeenth session will be elected from among the representatives of countries members of the African Group while the rapporteur will be selected from among the representatives of countries members of Group B.

The Committee will complete its Bureau by electing five vice-chairmen, in accordance with rule 19 of the rules of procedure of the Main Committees, 2/ i.e. (one from Group B, one from Group D and three from Groups A and C combined).

Item 2: Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

The provisional agenda for the seventeenth session of the Special Committee on Preferences was approved at consultations convened by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, on 28 July 1989 pursuant to Trade and Development Board decision 143 (XVI).

In its decision 179 (XVIII) of 17 September 1978, the Board stipulated that the annual sessions of the Special Committee on Preferences should be conducted according to the following procedure:

> "1. The plenary meetings of the Special Committee on Preferences should be devoted primarily to issues of a general character concerning the generalized system of preferences.
>
> "2. During the sessions of the Special Committee on Preferences, informal plurilateral consultations should be held on individual schemes, if so requested, between preference-receiving countries, on the one hand, and the preference-giving country on the other. These plurilateral consultations would be private and confidential in character."

In his note of 18 January 1990, the Secretary-General of UNCTAD invited States members which were interested in holding plurilateral consultations to advise the secretariat well in advance of the seventeenth session of the Special Committee so that the necessary arrangements could be made for holding such consultations. The secretariat will in due course inform States members concerned of requests received and of consequent arrangements for consultations.

As noted in the annotation to item 4, that item is to be considered in a sessional committee. It is suggested that, in accordance with usual practice, the sessional committee elect a chairman and a vice-chairman-cum-rapporteur.

Item 3: Comprehensive review of the Generalized System of Preferences, including its implementation, maintenance, improvement and utilization

The Special Committee will have before it the "Comprehensive review of the Generalized System of Preferences, including its implementation, maintenance, improvement and utilization" (TD/B/C.5/130). The report is divided into two parts. Part one gives a factual account of the changes and improvements in the various schemes since the last review; part two provides the materials required to undertake the comprehensive review of the Generalized System of Preferences 1979-1989. Actual experience with the GSP over the past 10 years is reviewed in the report which also provides an indication of the problems and shortcomings of the system in terms of major elements. The report examines the actual and potential trade effects of the GSP, assesses the trade implications of an expanded product coverage and, after exploring the interdependent nature of some GSP elements, suggests possible avenues for improving the schemes.

Also relevant to the consideration of this agenda item are the replies received from preference-giving countries on the operation and effects of the various schemes (TD/B/C.5/PREF/32 to 34) as well as the notes by the UNCTAD secretariat providing the latest information on the application of EEC ceilings (TD/B/C.5/EEC/19) and the quota scheme of Japan (TD/B/C.5/JAPAN/14).

Item 4: Harmonization and improvement of rules of origin

For this item, the Committee had normally had before it the report of the Working Group on Rules of Origin, which met prior to the annual session of the Committee. In its resolution 352 (XXXIV), the Trade and Development Board endorsed the recommendations of the Ad hoc Intergovernmental Working Group on the In-Depth Study of the United Nations Intergovernmental Structure and Functions in the Economic and Social Fields, whereby the Working Group was converted into a sessional committee of the Special Committee on Preferences. 3/ Accordingly, this agenda item will be considered by a sessional committee to be established. The secretariat has prepared a report entitled "Improvements in the rules of origin, including harmonization: identification and promotion of possible initiatives" (TD/B/C.5/120), in order to assist the sessional committee in its tasks of identifying and promoting the adoption of initiatives relating to the harmonization, simplification and liberalization of the GSP rules of origin, in response to Conference resolution 159 (VI). In its agreed conclusions 10 (XVI), the Committee decided to carry forward deliberations of this item to the seventeenth session.

Item 5: Technical assistance in connection with the generalized system of preferences

The Special Committee will have before it a report on "Technical co-operation in connection with the generalized system of preferences" (TD/B/C.5/128) covering the activities in 1989. The report underscores the importance of these activities and addresses the financial viability of the Geneva-based project of technical assistance on the GSP.

Item 6: Provisional agenda for the eighteenth session of the Special Committee on Preferences

In accordance with rule 8 of the rules of procedures of the main Committees (by which the Special Committee is guided), the secretariat will submit during the session a draft provisional agenda for the eighteenth session of the Committee.

Item 7: Other business

Under this agenda item, the Special Committee will consider a "Feasibility study for providing exporters and importers consolidated computerized information on the Generalized System of Preferences" (TD/B/C.5/129) as mandated in decision 9 (XVI) paragraph 7.

Item 8: Adoption of the report of the Special Committee on Preferences to the Trade and Development Board

The Board will consider the report of the Special Committee during the first part of its thirty-seventh session, scheduled to be held from 1 to 12 October 1990.

The attention of the Committee is drawn to paragraph 6 of decision 302 (XXIX) adopted by the Board on 21 September 1984, whereby the Board instructed its Main Committees and other subsidiary bodies to ensure that their reports were concise, action-oriented and not exceeding the limit of 32 pages.

The Committee may wish to invite the Rapporteur, in co-operation with the Friends of the Rapporteur and the secretariat, to make every possible effort to conform to this decision of the Board.

Notes

1/ Offical Records of the Trade and Development Board, thirteenth session, Supplement No. 3 (TD/B/442), paras. 230-232.

2/ At its fifth session the Committee decided to continue being guided, as appropriate, by the rules of procedure of the Committee on Manufactures (ibid., para. 230), which have since been incorporated into a consolidated set of rules of procedure of the Main Committees of the Board (TD/B/740).

3/ TD/B/1154, para. 39.

READEX FICHE

UNITED
NATIONS

TD

United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development

Distr.
GENERAL

TD/B/C.5/128
7 February 1990

Original: ENGLISH

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Special Committee on Preferences
Seventeenth session
Geneva, 14 May 1990
Item 5 of the provisional agenda

TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Report by the UNCTAD secretariat

GE.90-50285/1699B

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs
Introduction and summary	1 - 5
Chapter	
I. Mobilization of support for technical co-operation activities on the GSP and other trade laws	6 - 9
II. Technical co-operation activities on the GSP and other trade laws in 1989	10 - 20
A. Advisory missions	11
B. Training activities	12 - 15
C. Support to specific activities by member States	16 - 19
D. Fund-raising missions	20
III. Future of the technical co-operation activities on the GSP and other trade laws	21 - 27

ANNEXES

Annex

I. Estimated expenditures in support of UNDP/UNCTAD global technical co-operation activities through trust fund and in-kind contributions from preference-giving countries and the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT in 1989

II. Summary of contributions to GSP technical co-operation activities in 1989

III. Summary table of activities undertaken in 1989 and number of participants who received training

IV. Summary table of national and regional seminars and participants who received training for 1984 to 1989 by the UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme on the GSP (including UNDP-funded regional projects)

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1. This report covers UNCTAD technical co-operation on the generalized system of preferences (GSP) for the period January-December 1989. The report has been prepared to assist the Special Committee on Preferences at its seventeenth session in its consideration of GSP technical co-operation activities.

2. In 1989, the delivery rate of technical co-operation on the GSP and other trade laws was the highest ever. This high rate of delivery was due to an increasing interest in the GSP shown by beneficiaries and was made possible by UNDP and trust fund contributions which financed the seminars.

3. In 1989, 71 activities were undertaken in all regions of the world. These included 34 training seminars - 6 at the regional/subregional level and 28 at the national level - and 15 advisory missions aimed primarily at advising preference-receiving countries on the establishment or upgrading of GSP focal points. In all, 1,887 participants received training during these activities, the majority in national seminars where most participants represented the private and public interests actually using the GSP.

4. Total extra-budgetary funding for global GSP activities in 1989 amounted to $1.4 million, of which UNDP accounted for $565,000 or 41 per cent, with the remainder arising from trust fund contributions. In-kind and trust fund contributions of all kinds amounted to $794,000 in 1989, of which trust funds for specific purposes amounted to roughly $542,000, in-kind contributions to $155,000 and general trust funds to $97,000. The latter amount in general trust funds was made available to operate the Geneva-based interregional programme which services all projects in the network. In view of the large number of activities requiring technical and administrative backstopping, increased general trust funds for financing support personnel (a GSP expert and a secretary), seminars, travel and administration are indispensable if the anticipated activities for 1990 are to be carried out. In this regard, only $40,000 have so far been pledged by Sweden. Consequently, if more general trust funds are not made available, there will have to be a cutback and/or a postponement of the planned programme for 1990.

5. The growing activities of the various projects, particularly in Africa, are creating an increased awareness and interest in the GSP which is leading to more demands for training activities. If this growing interest and use of GSP is to be maintained, the support for the Geneva-based Programme must grow commensurately. It is therefore important that, at the seventeenth session of the Special Committee on Preferences, States members of UNCTAD consider the question of the financial requirements and mobilize the necessary resources in order that the needs of developing countries in this area can be met.

Chapter I

MOBILIZATION OF SUPPORT FOR TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES ON THE GSP AND OTHER TRADE LAWS

6. The UNCTAD technical co-operation Programme on the GSP and other trade laws is currently composed of three UNDP-financed regional projects, a UNDP-financed national project in Indonesia and a Geneva-based UNCTAD interregional project which provides logistical, administrative and technical support to all projects. The latter project is funded entirely by funds in trust. 1/

7. Three categories of trust fund contributions are made by member States. The general trust funds, which provide the only source of finance for the operational aspects of the Programme in support of global technical co-operation on the GSP, are primarily used to cover the salaries of support personnel (a GSP expert and a secretary) located in Geneva, travel of experts, hiring of consultants and other administrative and logistical costs. The UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme is, on its own account, also responsible for seminars as well as other advisory and training activities in countries not covered by the regional projects. In this connection, insufficient funding by UNDP in relation to demands for technical co-operation in the Latin American and Caribbean region, has made further demands on the limited funds available to the Geneva Programme. In 1989 such general trust funds amounted to some $97,000, which represents only 12 per cent of the total trust funds provided to UNCTAD for GSP technical co-operation. Other trust funds provided are for specific purposes, such as finance of seminars, provision of associate experts, etc., and in-kind contributions, such as the provision of experts by preference-giving countries to participate in seminar activities. While these types of trust fund contributions are substantial, making up the bulk of the total trust funds, they are not used to support the Geneva-based focal point. There is consequently a need for UNCTAD member States to increase their general trust fund support in order that the UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme on the GSP and Other Trade Laws can provide the backstopping necessary for the programme as a whole to operate. In the absence of such funding, the effective utilization of the in-kind contributions and trust funds for specific purposes and the UNDP funding of the national and three regional projects will be in jeopardy.

8. Of the 11 schemes operated by OECD member States in 1989, trust funds of a general nature came from only three preference-giving countries, namely, Switzerland ($50,000), Sweden ($40,000) and Norway ($7,210) (see annex II). The only pledge of such general trust funds for 1990 thus far is from Sweden ($40,000). It is hoped that member States will respond and provide the general operating funds to enable the Programme to carry out its obligations vis-à-vis the developing countries. Approximately $150,000 in additional funding will be necessary to fulfil planned activities in 1990.

9. UNDP funding for the three regional projects and the national GSP project in Indonesia in 1989 amounted to approximately $565,000, broken down as follows: Africa $187,000; Asia and the Pacific $231,000; Latin America and the Caribbean $56,000; and, the national project on rules of origin in Indonesia approximately $91,000 (see annex II). Out of the total funding of global UNCTAD GSP activities in 1989 which amounted to $1.4 million, UNDP accounted for 41 per cent with, as mentioned above, the remainder arising from trust fund contributions from member States.

Chapter II

TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES ON THE GSP AND OTHER TRADE LAWS IN 1989

10. In 1989, 71 activities were undertaken by the UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme on the GSP and Other Trade Laws (see annex III). Of these, 34 training seminars were held - 6 at the regional/subregional level and 28 at the national level. Fifteen advisory missions were undertaken in all regions of the world aimed primarily at advising preference-receiving countries on the establishment or upgrading of GSP focal points. Additional missions included three courtesy calls and two fund-raising missions to preference-giving countries en route to seminar activities, participation in two trade fairs and two tripartite review meetings. In all, 1,887 participants received training in these activities, the majority in national seminars where most participants represented the private and public trading interests actually using the GSP.

A. Advisory missions

11. Ten advisory missions in connection with the establishment and/or improvement of GSP focal points were undertaken in 1989 as follows: Bolivia (three missions) and El Salvador in the Latin American and Caribbean region; Benin, Guinea and Togo in the African region; and Tonga, Singapore and the Maldives in the Asian and Pacific region. An UNCTAD sponsored advisory mission was also sent to Syrian Arab Republic. Additional advisory missions were held in Kenya, Malaysia, Thailand and with ESCAP concerning a UNDP-financed UNCTAD/ESCAP study programme on the GSP.

B. Training activities

12. In 1989 more training missions were carried out by the UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme on the GSP and Other Trade Laws than ever before (see annex IV). As mentioned above, this was largely due to the generous in-kind contributions from preference-giving countries (see annex I) and the specific contributions of Sweden, Japan, Switzerland and the United States.

13. The largest number of training activities were held in the African region, where awareness of the GSP is now becoming more widespread. As a result of the regional seminars held in Africa, many requests for national seminars have been forthcoming. These national seminars are aimed at exposing the maximum number of traders and government officials to the intricacies of the various schemes. The seminars concentrate on being product-specific and analyse the specific export interests of each country visited in the context of the GSP. The GSP has been promoted as a complement to the other special preferential treatments, such as the Lomé Convention, which the majority of African developing countries use. In the past, little attention has been paid to diversifying the exports of those countries to alternative markets. Training on the GSP and more particularly on the special measures for least developed countries under the GSP has motivated trading interests to examine their position in alternative GSP markets. During the training missions, where possible, visits are made to the trading focal point or export promotion centres to examine these facilities and make recommendations for their improvement and for the provision of all relevant resource materials necessary for the effective use of the GSP.

14. The feedback arising from the seminars and their reports has the additional benefit of providing inputs to the substantive work undertaken in UNCTAD on the GSP at its annual sessions of the Special Committee on Preferences and in the sessional committees on the rules of origin. UNCTAD staff members involved in the substantive work also participate, where feasible, as experts in seminars and advisory missions. This field experience has improved their awareness of the real problems developing countries face in using the GSP and has positively contributed to the quality of the substantive work of the GSP Section. New pedagogical approaches have been developed to provide simplified explanations of the complicated rules of origin and other provisions of the GSP. Likewise, lectures on the Harmonized System (HS) are now a permanent part of the programme. Revised GSP handbooks based on the Harmonized System are now distributed in training missions in three languages. Handbooks on the other trade laws affecting the exports from developing countries are also made available during training and advisory missions. The UNCTAD secretariat complements the Programme's training activities by providing detailed computer print-outs of the actual trade flows between the countries visited and the preference-giving countries, including tariff and sub-tariff line details on NTMs which affect the trade of these countries. In support of GSP technical co-operation, the secretariat is also undertaking analysis of GSP utilization in 30 developing countries and providing the results to the Governments concerned for their use in improving GSP performance.

15. During 1989, a revised handbook on the scheme of New Zealand, based on the HS, as well as a revision of the trade law manual for the United States were published. A handout containing information on the special treatment for least developed countries was also published for use in training missions.

C. Support to specific activities by member States

16. Specific seminar activities were financed by four preference-giving countries during 1989. Sweden (IMPOD), the largest contributor in this regard, financed the following seminars: a regional seminar for SADCC countries in Harare, Zimbabwe (16-20 January); a regional seminar for Central American countries, Panama and the Dominican Republic in San José, Costa Rica (4-8 September); national seminars for six SADCC countries, namely, Zambia (13-15 June), Mozambique (19-21 June), Lesotho (18-20 July), Swaziland (24-26 July), United Republic of Tanzania (13-15 November) and Malawi (20-22 November); and a national seminar for Thailand (15-17 May). Japan funded the following: a regional seminar for Maghreb countries in Rabat, Morocco (30 October-3 November) and a regional seminar for Central American and Caribbean countries and territories in Kingston, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (4-8 December). Switzerland financed a regional seminar for African least developed countries in Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania (6-10 November) and the United States a regional seminar for Eastern and Southern African countries in Nairobi, Kenya (9-13 January).

17. It should be noted that, in addition to the regional seminars financed by the Japanese trust fund, provision is also made to cover the costs of two studies on regional cumulation for ASEAN and Latin American countries. Additionally, the Government of Japan continues to finance the salary of an associate expert attached to the UNDP/UNCTAD Regional Project for Asia and the Pacific (RAS/89/028) in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

18. The Government of Italy financed the salary and travel of two associate experts in 1989, one stationed in Harare, Zimbabwe, and the other in Geneva.

19. The Government of Austria, continuing an established practice, provided the UNCTAD Programme on the GSP with 25,000 copies of the GSP certificate of origin, form A, for distribution to requesting beneficiary countries.

D. Fund-raising missions

20. En route to and from official project activities, two fund-raising missions were undertaken, one to Canada and the other to the United States. As a result, in-kind contributions from both preference-giving countries were received during 1989.

Chapter III

FUTURE OF THE TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES ON THE GSP AND OTHER TRADE LAWS

21. 1989 proved to be the most productive year for GSP technical co-operation so far. Overall funding from all sources for the Programme increased by 81 per cent over that of 1988. The number of persons who received training doubled over the same period and there was a more than three-fold increase in activities carried out under the Programme. Actual and anticipated requests for the services of the Programme in 1990 indicate that the demand for technical co-operation will probably be greater than in 1989.

22. The ever-increasing demand for training and advisory missions by countries which hitherto had not used the GSP, particularly in Africa, warrants the continued financial support of States members of UNCTAD. The recent granting of beneficiary status to Poland and Hungary by many preference-giving countries will require that multi-city seminars on the GSP be provided to assist traders to understand and utilize the GSP schemes and to assist in the establishment of GSP focal points. It is therefore hoped that Governments will provide the general trust fund with the necessary support and will continue to show the spirit of international co-operation which has made the UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme successful, in order that the requests made by developing countries for more technical co-operation on the GSP and other trade laws can be realized.

23. In 1990, preliminary work will begin on the computerization of materials for GSP missions. 2/ Lap-top personal computers will be purchased for use by the various GSP projects on missions as well as to improve communication between the Geneva-based Programme and the regional projects in the matter of report writing and dissemination of statistics.

24. Following a tripartite review in May 1989, the UNDP/UNCTAD Regional GSP Project for Asia and the Pacific was extended for a further two-year period and the Malaysian Government agreed to host the Project for this period. This phase of the Project includes a study programme on the effects of graduation on the region, to be carried out by ESCAP under a sub-contract arrangement with UNCTAD. In 1989, an associate expert, financed by the Japanese Government, joined the office in Kuala Lumpur for a two-year period to assist the regional adviser in carrying out the project activities.

25. A favourable tripartite review for the UNDP/UNCTAD Regional GSP Project for Africa was held in November 1989. The continuation of the Project beyond April 1990 depends on an independent evaluation to be undertaken early in 1990.

26. Likewise, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean is examining the prospects for continuing finance of the UNDP/UNCTAD Regional GSP Project for Latin America and the Caribbean in 1990.

27. Despite the growth of the Programme as a whole, the essential general trust fund financing for the Geneva-based UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme on the GSP and Other Trade Laws, which backstops and services activities in all regions, declined from $137,000 in 1988 to $97,000 in 1989. 3/ As was previously mentioned, preference-giving countries have been

very willing to fund specific activities and/or provide in-kind contributions. However, very few preference-giving countries have contributed to the general trust funds required to maintain the entire Programme. One possible remedy in the future might be to include programme support funding in the budgets of the specific trust funds. For 1990 only one preference-giving country, Sweden, has pledged general trust funds to the Programme. In the absence of further contributions of this type, it will be difficult to fulfil the many requests for the Programme's services. Such a situation is ironical because, despite the UNDP funding available under the regional projects, these projects will be unable to carry out their activities effectively in the absence of experts and technical and administrative support from the Geneva Programme.

Notes

1/ The formal title of the trust-fund-financed programme is the "UNCTAD technical assistance programme on the generalized system of preferences (GSP) and on other trade laws and regulations directly affecting exports of developing countries" (INT/84/A01). The UNDP-financed regional projects are: UNDP/UNCTAD Regional Project for Asia and the Pacific, "The Generalized System of Preferences (GSP): Training and studies" (RAS/89/028); UNDP/UNCTAD African Regional Project on the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) (RAF/86/057); UNDP/UNCTAD Regional Project for Latin America and the Caribbean "Technical Co-operation on the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) and Other Trade Laws" (RLA/88/019). The national project (for Indonesia) is "Optimum utilization of the rules of origin and other customs procedures related to GSP" (INS/86/007).

2/ See document TD/B/C.5/229 on this subject which is before the Special Committee.

3/ General trust funding for the Geneva-based Programme in previous years was as follows: 1984 - $162,000; 1985 - $48,754; 1986 - $169,193; and, 1987 - $100,000.

ANNEXES

Annex I

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF UNDP/UNCTAD GLOBAL TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES THROUGH TRUST FUND AND IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PREFERENCE-GIVING COUNTRIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE UNCTAD/GATT (ITC) IN 1989

(in US dollars)*

ACTIVITY	Project	Australia	Austria	Canada	EEC	Japan	Netherlands	New Zealand	Sweden	Switzerland	United States	ITC
Regional seminar on the GSP for Eastern and Southern African countries, Nairobi, Kenya (9-13 January)	RAF/86/057	1 250[a/]		1 250[a/]	1 250[a/]				8 838[a/]		44 300[b/] 19 216[a/]	
Regional seminar on GSP for SADCC countries, Harare, Zimbabwe (16-20 January)	RAF/86/057	1 250[a/]		1 250[a/]	1 250[a/]				21 310[b/]			
National seminar on GSP, Banjul, the Gambia (9-10 March)	RAF/86/057											
National seminars on GSP, Lagos and Kano, Nigeria (15-22 March)	RAF/86/057	1 750[a/]		1 750[a/]								
National seminar on GSP and other trade laws, Bangkok, Thailand (15-17 May)	RAS/84/023	750[a/]		5 055[a/]					11 402[b/] 4 715[a/]		750[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Accra, Ghana (23-26 May)	RAF/86/057										750[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Lusaka, Zambia (13-15 June)	RAF/86/057	750[a/]		750[a/]	750[a/]				26 544[b/]		750[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Maputo, Mozambique (19-21 June)	RAF/86/057				750[a/]						750[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Yangon, Myanmar (12-13 July)	RAS/84/023)											
National seminar on GSP, Maseru, Lesotho (18-20 July)	R/F/86/057)	750[a/]							7 370[a/]		750[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Mbabane, Swaziland (24-26 July)	RAF/86/057	1 265[a/]		1 265[a/]					23 352[b/]			
National seminars on GSP, Sialkot and Peshawar, Pakistan (29 July - 2 August)	RAS/84/023			2 170[a/]								
National seminar on GSP and other trade laws, San José, Costa Rica (30 August - 1 September)	RLA/88/019 INT/84/A01			2 000[a/]					6 170[a/]		3 415[a/]	
Regional seminar on GSP and other trade laws for Central American countries, Panama and the Dominican Republic, San José, Costa Rica (4-8 September)	RLA/88/019 INT/84/A01								49 000[b/]			
National seminar on GSP and other trade laws, Managua, Nicaragua (11-13 September)	RLA/88/019			750[a/]								
National seminar on GSP, Amman, Jordan (17-20 September)	INT/84/A01										750[a/]	2 747[a/]

ACTIVITY	Project	Australia	Austria	Canada	EEC	Japan	Netherlands	New Zealand	Sweden	Switzerland	United States	ITC
National seminar on GSP and other trade laws, San Salvador, El Salvador (18-20 September)	RLA/88/019 INT/84/A01										750[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Conakry, Guinea (18-22 September)	RAF/86/057										750[a/]	
National seminars on GSP and other trade laws, Manila and Cagayan de Oro, Philippines (2-6 October)	RAS/89/028	1 235[a/]		1 235[a/]							1 235[a/]	
National seminar on GSP, Nairobi, Kenya (4-6 October)	RAF/86/057	750[a/]		750[a/]							750[a/]	
Regional seminar on GSP and other trade laws for Maghreb countries, Rabat, Morocco (30 October - 3 November)	INT/89/057 INT/84/A01			1 250[a/]		2 895[a/] 31 305[b/]					4 485[a/]	
Regional seminar on GSP for African LDCs, Arusha, Tanzania (6-10 November)	RAF/86/057	1 390[a/]							16 870[a/]	52 000[b/] 5 325[a/]		
National seminar on GSP, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania (13-15 November)	RAF/86/057								750[a/] 25 488[b/]			
National seminar on GSP, Lilongwe, Malawi (20-22 November)	RAF/86/057								1 295[a/]		750[a/]	
National seminars on GSP and other trade laws, Surabaya, Semarang, Jakarta, Indonesia (20-28 November)	RAS/89/028	750[a/]		3 205[a/]				750[a/]			2 180[a/]	
Regional seminar on GSP and other trade laws for Central American and Caribbean countries and territories, Kingstown, St. Vincent and the Grenadines (4-8 December)	RLA/88/019 INT/89/057 INT/84/A01	1 535[a/]		1 100[a/]	5 730[a/]	1 035[a/] 41 180[b/]	1 750[a/]		1 750[a/]			
National seminar on GSP, Suva, Fiji (12-13 December)	RAS/89/028			2 930[a/]								
National seminar on GSP, Tarawa, Kiribati (18 December)	RAS/89/028											
Provision of Form A			5 000									
Total individual country contributions		13 425	5 000	26 710	9 730	76 415	1 750	750	204 854	57 325	82 331	2 747

TOTAL CONTRIBUTION: $481 037

* Estimated at United Nations rates.

a/ Experts' salary, travel and DSA.

b/ Trust funds for specific seminar activities.

Annex II

Summary of contributions to GSP technical co-operation activities in 1989
(in US dollars)

Country	Estimated in kind contributions a/	Trust fund contributions		Total
		Specific purposes	General	
Austria	5 000	-	-	5 000
Australia	13 425	-	-	13 425
Canada	26 710	-	-	26 710
EEC	9 730	-	-	9 730
Italy	-	116 272 */	-	116 272
Japan	3 930	172 287 **/	-	176 217
Netherlands	1 750	-	-	1 750
New Zealand	750	-	-	750
Norway	-	-	7 210	7 210
Sweden	47 758	157 096	40 000	244 854
Switzerland	5 325	52 000	50 000	107 325
United States	38 031	44 300	-	82 331
ITC	2 747	-	-	2 747
TOTAL	155 156	541 955	97 210	794 321
UNDP funding (National and regional projects)	-	-	-	564 856
GRAND TOTAL	-	-	-	1 359 177

a/ Participation of experts (salary, travel and per diem) and provision of pamphlets, etc.

*/ Salary and travel for associate experts.

**/ Including $53,087 for salary and travel of associate expert.

Annex III

Summary table of activities undertaken in 1989 and number of participants who received training

Project	Number of seminars/missions	Number of participants who received training a/
INT/84/A01	1 national seminar	123
	3 advisory missions	N.A.
	2 fund raising missions	N.A.
INT/84/A01) INT/89/057)	1 regional seminar	11
INT/84/A01) INT/89/057) RLA/88/019)	1 regional seminar	16
RAF/86/057	3 regional seminars	53
	13 national seminars	461
	6 advisory missions	N.A.
	2 courtesy missions	N.A.
	2 trade fairs	N.A.
	1 tripartite review meeting	N.A.
RAS/84/023)	11 national seminars	602
RAS/89/028)	3 advisory missions	N.A.
	1 courtesy mission	N.A.
	1 tripartite review meeting	N.A.
RLA/88/019)	1 regional seminar	13
INT/84/A01)	3 national seminars	133
	2 advisory missions	N.A.
INS/86/007	13 workshops	457
	1 advisory mission	N.A.
TOTAL	6 regional seminars	93
	28 national seminars	1 317
	13 workshops	475
	15 advisory missions	N.A.
	3 courtesy missions	N.A.
	2 trade fairs	N.A.
	2 fund raising missions	N.A.
	2 tripartite review meetings	N.A.
GRAND TOTAL	71 Activities	1 887

a/ Regional seminars: participants limited to one or two per country.

Annex IV

Summary table of national and regional seminars and participants who received training from 1984 to 1989 by the UNCTAD Technical Co-operation Programme on the GSP (including UNDP-funded regional projects)

Year	Number of seminars	Number of participants who received training a/
1984	8 (3 regional, 5 national)	414
1985	8 (4 regional, 4 national)	293
1986	14 (3 regional, 11 national)	825
1987	20 (6 regional, 14 national)	1 385
1988	14 (4 regional, 10 national)	918
1989	34 (6 regional, 28 national)	1 887

a/ Regional seminars: participants limited to one or two per country.

UNITED
NATIONS

TD

United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development

Distr.
GENERAL

TD/B/C.5/129
7 February 1990

Original: ENGLISH

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Special Committee on Preferences
Seventeenth session
Geneva, 14 May 1989
Item 7 of the provisional agenda

FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR PROVIDING EXPORTERS AND IMPORTERS CONSOLIDATED COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION ON THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Study by the UNCTAD secretariat

GE.90-50291/5374A

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs
Introduction		1 - 2
I.	The proposed solution	3 - 7
II.	Advantages and disadvantages of the proposed solution	8 - 11
III.	Data requirements	12 - 16
IV.	Software requirements	17 - 18
V.	Distribution and user requirements	19 - 22
VI.	Training	23 - 24
VII.	Estimation of costs	25 - 26
VIII.	Expected output	27 - 31

Annex I: Option I: Main data provided by the preference-giving countries

Annex II: Option II: All data inputted by UNCTAD

SURVEY OF THE QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF UNCTAD PUBLICATIONS AND OF THEIR END-USERS

The UNCTAD secretariat, in the context of its programme evaluation activities and in response to intergovernmental requests, is seeking the opinions of end-users in order to have basic data for assessing the quality, usefulness and effectiveness of *inter alia* its research reports and publications. As the success of such an exercise is critically dependent on an adequate rate of response we should appreciate it if you would take time to answer the questions below and submit any other comments that you may have concerning the current document.

1. **Title or symbol number of document** . . . . . .

2. **When did you receive the document?** . . . . . .

3. **How did you receive the document?** *(tick one or more boxes)*

Through Permanent Mission to United Nations	( )	From UN bookshop	( )
From ministry or government office	( )	From university libraries	( )
Directly from UNCTAD secretariat	( )	Own request	( )
By participating in an UN/UNCTAD intergovernmental meeting	( )	UNCTAD initiative	( )
By participating in an UN/UNCTAD sponsored training course or seminar	( )	Other (please specify)	

4. **For what main purposes do you use the document?** *(tick one or more boxes)*

Policy formulation	( )	Education and training	( )
Analysis and research	( )	Management	( )
Legislation	( )	Other (please specify)	
Background information	( )		

5. **How do you rate the document as regards:**

Its usefulness to your work *(tick one box)*

Extremely useful ( ); Very useful ( ); Useful ( ); Marginally useful ( ); Not at all ( ).

Its quality, in terms of the following aspects *(tick one box in each case)*:

	Outstanding	*Excellent*	*Good*	*Adequate*	*Poor*
Presentation and readability	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Originality of ideas	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Wealth of information	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Up-to-date information	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Technical accuracy	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Quality of analysis, including objectivity	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Validity of conclusions	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Clarity of recommendations	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comprehensiveness of coverage	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. **Other observations** *(if any)* . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Finally, we would appreciate it if you could provide the following information about yourself:

Name . . . . . .Occupation/Functional title . . . . . .

Address . . . . . .

Your answers are for internal use and will be kept confidential. Thank you for your co-operation.

Please forward the questionnaire to : PROGRAMME CO-ORDINATION AND EVALUATION UNIT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT
PALAIS DES NATIONS – CH-1211 GENEVA 10

Introduction

1. This report has been prepared in response to decision 9 (XVI) of the Special Committee on Preferences which invited the UNCTAD secretariat: "to study the feasibility as well as the usefulness for exporters and importers of consolidating information on the GSP and to report on its findings at its seventeenth session". Exporters, importers, chambers of commerce and industry, government officials and trade promotion offices have continuously drawn attention to the need for up-to-date, practical information on the operation of the GSP. The UNCTAD secretariat has responded as best as it could, but has faced many constraints arising from the different classification systems in use and the many operational differences that exist amongst the 16 GSP schemes. Furthermore, most of this information was neither in a computer-retrievable form nor at the appropriate level of disaggregation to be used by exporters and importers.

2. With the adoption of the Harmonized System by all preference-giving countries, and the growing in-house capability of UNCTAD to build consolidated computerized and software data systems, it is now possible to address the needs of GSP users. The present feasibility study examines this issue and proposes a solution which, if agreed to by member States and implemented, will provide a practical consolidation of information on the GSP, which will be simple to use by all interested parties.

I. THE PROPOSED SOLUTION

3. The development of a data base to be accessed in a user-friendly manner through micro-computers seems to be the most cost effective and useful solution to provide data on trade, tariffs and special requirements on GSP rates. The UNCTAD secretariat has a proven capability in the development of related data bases and software systems involving trade control measures such as SMART and TCMIS-micro. SMART is a package that can be used for trade negotiations as well as for analysing restrictions on trade. TCMIS-micro is used in the dissemination of trade control measures and can already handle some important functions such as searches of a product code when the user knows only the description. It also allows a cross-country comparison on the basis of selected data elements - i.e. total imports, tariff ranges, and percentage of lines covered by NTMs. The available packages are limited to CCCN-based classifications and, therefore, will have to be adapted to the Harmonized System (HS) which is now applied by the developed-market economy preference-giving countries.

4. The proposed solution would require users to have an IBM-compatible micro-computer with at least one floppy disk and a hard disk. The size of the data required, and hence of the machine to handle it, depends on the number of countries that it wished to access simultaneously. On average, an estimation of 3 megabytes per country seems reasonable. Therefore, if it is assumed that a typical user would like to have five major markets simultaneously accessible, a hard disk of at least 20 megabytes would be necessary. This is already widely available today in the AT-class machines or, even better, with the new PS/2. In the near future, an important upgrade in the size of data that micro-computers can handle is expected and there should be no major difficulties for develping countries to be able to access the required data, even in small GSP focal points and trade promotion offices or by individual traders with micro-computer capacities. The widespread availability of

micro-computers capable of utilizing the proposed solution makes it specially desirable, not only because many developing countries already have the means to benefit, but also because the solution renders well for dissemination within each developing country.

5. The proposed system would consist of the following items: (i) software; (ii) data; (iii) tutorial materials, including an operations manual.

6. The software should allow the user to access the data in a user-friendly way and would have at least the following characteristics:

(i) Ability to classify directly from a simple product description on an HS, CCCN or SITC basis;

(ii) Access to customs tariff lines, departing from any classification like CCCN, SITC Revision 1, Revision 2 and Revision 3 and the HS;

(iii) Simultaneous access to different schemes. This would be done at the six-digit level comprising over 5,000 items common to all countries. The selected data elements would be displayed on a common screen, thus providing the basis for comparisons among different schemes. By very simple operations pressing some PF keys the user could get more detailed information at the national tariff line level, where most GSP products are defined. At this detailed level of disaggregation, it would be possible to see not only the description of the selected tariff line, but also the rate or the most important rates that are applied. In addition, for each item involving limitations in respect to countries that could benefit, the list of included or excluded countries would be provided, as well as any relevant applicable remark. Some other elements useful for broader analysis could be provided at the common HS six-digit level. For example, the coverage ratio of NTMs, i.e. the percentage of national tariff lines included in an HS line that are covered by any non-tariff measures as well as the coverage ratio for the GSP, i.e. the percentage of national tariff lines included in the HS line for which a GSP rate is present;

(iv) Direct access to each market through an option that would be called "view". Under this option, the user would type in only the desired country code and would be provided with all the national tariff line descriptions. The system would include a facility to assist users in finding items they would like to analyse in detail. It would only be necessary to type in key words and the items including such key words in its descriptions would be displayed.

7. In summary, the user would access the data in a user-friendly manner by typing the country code, the product code, or both. In the first case, access to the option "view" would provide the description of all national tariff lines which permit the search for a specific item (either by knowing its classification or some key words that appear in its description). Thus, he would immediately access the data on a product/country specific basis. In the first case, when he accesses the system by choosing a product, he would have a cross-country comparison. Since the system is interactive, it would be

easy for users to check many products on a one-by-one basis. In respect to each item of interest users would be able to get a detailed printout of the trade control measures applied on the different tariff lines that are included in each HS six-digit line. There will be an on-line help facility enabling even users that are not familiar with computers to understand how to proceed. An operation manual will be provided and some training, if required, could be foreseen.

II. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED SOLUTION

8. Since the proposed solution is designed to be user-friendly it has a major advantage vis-à-vis printouts, i.e. it will not only allow analyses of products on a comparative basis, but will also be useful for GSP trade promotion. The GSP focal points and TPOs will be in a position to offer to exporters the relevant information on requirements and limitations of the application of the GSP schemes as well as some other indicators such as the major suppliers to each market for each selected product, the prevailing MFN rates, GSP rates and the existence of any non-tariff measure (NTM) applied. Use of the HS classification, moreover, allows for a more detailed designation of the product, therefore defining "products" and not "family of products" as in other classifications such as the SITC. The fact that the system will operate on a PC will enormously facilitate its dissemination in developing countries.

9. A "main frame" solution could be envisaged. However, due to poor telecommunications in many developing countries and the high costs involved in accessing a data base using international telephone lines, it does not appear to be a real alternative. The "main-frame" solution would provide on-line access to any changes in either the GSP schemes' parameters or any other variable covered by the system. Nevertheless, such an advantage is attenuated by the fact that the kind of information utilized by the system does not change frequently. Experience reveals that customs duties and, certainly, tariff classifications do not change very often. Thus, the additional complexity and costs do not appear to justify a "main-frame" solution.

10. In the context of the proposed solution, it is envisaged that PC diskettes could be provided to users once a year at no cost, incorporating any changes in the related data bases. Moreover, should there be any important changes in the main schemes there would be, in principle, no difficulties in undertaking special issues of diskettes incorporating the changed data in the relevant markets. The proposed solution would also provide exporters in developing countries with a basis for assessing the type of tariffs and NTMs they face and the preferential advantage they will receive through comparison of GSP and MFN rates as well as market size and shares. In addition, the proposed system will enable the institutions of developing countries, charged with managing foreign trade, to compare exhaustively and analyse their performance and their utilization of the GSP schemes without having to undertake any additional investment. Eventually, users could also be capable of accessing the raw data themselves, and creating user specific applications - i.e. new lay-outs for reports, etc - tailored to their specific requirements.

11. In conclusion, the proposed solution will be useful, cost effective, easy to use and will meet the needs of the different users, be they central government institutions, GSP focal points, local trade promotion offices or individual exporters and importers.

III. DATA REQUIREMENTS

12. The data required by the system will include the following: (i) tariff line description; (ii) trade flows: total imports and exports, major suppliers and their shares; (iii) tariffs: MFN, GSP, GSP for LDCs, and eventually other preferential rates such as Lomé, CBI, CARIBICAN, etc; (iv) utilization rates share of actual GSP trade out of GSP eligible trade (this is an optional data element that when available could be included in the data base); (v) other information such as rules of origin, special requirements, tariff quotas, fixed duty-free amounts, etc.

13. Most of this information is already available in computerized form in the relevant institution of the preference-giving countries and in a partial manner in international organizations. For instance, the International Tariff Customs Bureau in Brussels publishes for each country its tariff classification with the MFN rate, while GATT, with the implementation of the Integrated Data Base (IDB), collects data on tariff classification, trade flows and tariff rates. If the preference-giving countries would allow the use of this data, that is already available in the system, what would remain to be entered manually at UNCTAD would be limited to the special requirements and limitations on the applicability of the GSP rate.

14. Two cost estimate alternatives are presented: the first assumes that almost all the available data will be supplied in a machine readable form to UNCTAD in order to be incorporated in the system, while the second option considers that UNCTAD will have to collect and computerize a major portion of the data elements. In the first case, the amount of data which has to be entered by hand is quite limited. An estimation of the data required has been undertaken with a sampling of some different schemes so that a more informed estimate of the costs of assembling the required data could be made.

15. The different requirements, limitations and coverage of the GSP schemes will, with the exception of the EEC scheme, require an average time of about one month per scheme. The EEC scheme will require two to three man-months, depending on the form the new annual schemes will take.

16. The second alternative, which assumes that all or most existing machine readable data would <u>not</u> be made available to the creation of the system, would appear so absurd to carry out, in view of the duplication of past work it would entail and the consequent excessive additional costs, that it could not be seriously considered as a practical alternative. Nevertheless, should it be taken as the desirable solution, then it will be necessary to utilize about 24 man-months of coding clerk services to digitalize the required data. Furthermore, such a procedure, besides being a waste of resources, is likely to add errors, due to misunderstandings or typing mistakes.

IV. SOFTWARE REQUIREMENTS

17 In the Trade Control Measures Information Service (TCMIS) of UNCTAD, a software package, written in the programming language "C", is already available for assisting South-South co-operation. This software could be adapted to take into consideration the special needs of the GSP without any major changes on its programming structure. The present system is based on the CCCN classification, so that all software providing access to files would have to be rewritten. In addition, substantial efforts are necessary for

incorporating the special parameters relating to the utilization of the GSP schemes. The approach envisaged includes the creation of two new files to take into consideration the specific GSP requirements and parameters. The data would first be presented in a summarized (HS six-digit level) form and only when the user wishes to proceed into greater detail, would the system provide information on a national tariff-line basis.

18. In summary, the approach regarding the software development for the proposed solution consists in building on existing and proven systems, rather than duplicating the previous work embodied in them. The essential consideration has been to economize in software development costs. An overall amount of six man-months programming should be adequate, assuming that the engagement of an expert with an extensive knowledge of the software used in the development of the already available packages is possible.

V. DISTRIBUTION AND USER REQUIREMENTS

19. The package - that is the software, data and the tutorial material - will be made available to users in the form of floppy disks. There will be the possibility of having the data on diskettes of five-and-a-quarter inches or three-and-a-half inches. In the case of five-and-a-quarter inches a large number of diskettes would be required since their capacity is limited to 360 k. In the case of high-density, double-side, three-and-a-half-inch diskettes, a set of two diskettes per country would be enough to store data for most preference-giving countries (around 3 megabytes for each country). From a practical point of view, it would be desirable to utilize the three-and-a-half-inch diskettes in order to minimize costs of their preparation and the time involved in loading/downloading the data on the system. Assuming that each GSP focal point will be interested in having information on at least 10 markets, 23 three-and-a-half-inch diskettes would be needed. In the case of five-and-a-quarter-inch diskettes it would add up to around 90 diskettes.

20. Given that, in almost all countries, copying of PC diskettes has become a trivial, widespread procedure, and the need to avoid added costs in the maintenance over time of the system, it is assumed that only a single copyable set of diskettes would be provided to each interested country. It would be for individual Governments to undertake the tasks of copying and distributing the package to its relevant administrative units. A full set of data will be prepared every 12 months (exceptionally, if deemed necessary, at shorter intervals) and it will be distributed with the data up-date and correction of the errors. It will comprise the complete data so that it would be easier for users to reload it instead of having to do selective reloading. The annual provision of a full data-set would minimize the need for users to possess extensive computer skills, since modifications of the data on the PC requires a special knowledge of data structure and the ability to reload the modified data.

21. Each user will need an access to an IBM-compatible computer with hard disk and floppy disks. It would be advisable to have a hard disk of at least 20 megabytes, so that many markets could be loaded at the same time, thus allowing inter-country comparisons. There will also be a facility to select the products so that users would be able to load only those products in which they are interested, keeping the others on diskettes, thus economizing in machine memory space.

22. A solution using CD-ROM (Compact Disk - Read Only Memory) is envisaged for a later stage, where all data referring to GSP preference-giving countries could be distributed in such a way. It will be necessary to wait until this technology becomes more popular and easier in terms of the response time to users. In fact, more than 550 megabytes can be stored on a CD-ROM. At the present stage the system would not have more than 50-80 megabytes, depending on the degree of detail and extension of data, so that all the data of the proposed system would fit in a single CD-ROM.

VI. TRAINING

23. Some training could be foreseen but a better solution will be the development of an on-line facility that can be used by the operators to train themselves. The user will be given an operations manual that he will use to understand how the system works and as a reference. At the same time there will be a help facility on each panel so that if the operator has a specific problem, he can refer to this on-line facility instead of having to look at the manual to find out what to do next.

24. Some training could be provided during seminars that are held on the GSP schemes by UNCTAD consultants and experts. More detailed information on the data structure could be given by the computer experts to those countries that might be interested in developing user specific reports to analyse the cross-country data in a more sophisticated way.

VII. ESTIMATION OF COSTS

25. Option I (see annex I) presupposes a full use of available machine-readable data, so that the part to be manually codified at UNCTAD would be limited to special requirements and other parameters specific to the GSP schemes, while all other relevant data would be supplied by the GSP preference-giving countries. In this case, the total cost is estimated to be $125,500.

- The programmer costs are estimated at six man-months and will not vary should the data be obtained in a machine-readable form from the preference-giving countries or wholly inputted at UNCTAD.

- Twelve man-months of a coding clerk is provided for the codification of the parameters specific to the GSP and not available elsewhere in machine-readable form.

26. Option II (see annex II) presupposes that all required data will be entered by UNCTAD, and is presented only as a comparison since it is a waste of resources. In this case, the total cost would be of $227,000. The following items are considered in more detail:

- Twenty-four man-months of a coding clerk should be added for Option II, i.e. all data is entered by UNCTAD.

- The costs associated with any training activity, if desirable, could be added to this estimate.

VIII. EXPECTED OUTPUT

27. An option integrated in the package will assist users to classify products in terms of the standard six-digit HS classification, i.e. over 5,000 items, from either a descriptive definition of the product or from any code like CCCN, SITC Rev.1, Rev.2 or Rev.3.

28. Once the user has identified the code of his product, he will be in a position to get a cross-country comparison based on total imports, tariff ranges, percentage of lines covered by NTMs and number of sub-tariff lines at the 8, 10 or 12-digit level.

29. At this point the user can access each national tariff schedule and see which lines at the 8, 10 or 12-digit level are included in the sub-heading with an indication of those which are covered by the GSP.

30. By going further into detail, he will see the following data elements: MFN rates, GSP, rates, NTMs applied and conditionalities on GSP (exclusions of beneficiaries, quantitative limitations, rules of origin, etc.).

31. All information can be instantly printed for reference and analytical work.

Annex I

Option I: Main data provided by the preference-giving countries

Budget line	Title	Man months	Total costs
11	EXPERTS		
11.01	Computer programmer	6	48 000
13.01	Support personnel	12	50 500
40	EQUIPMENT		
42.01	Non-expendable equipment (1 PC)		8 000
50	MISCELLANEOUS		
51.01	Manual (editing/publishing)		10 000
52.01	Preparation of data diskettes		9 000
99	TOTAL		125 500

Annex II

Option II: All data inputted by UNCTAD

Budget line	Title	Man months	Total costs
11	EXPERTS		
11.01	Computer programmer	6	48 000
13.01	Support personnel	36	152 000
40	EQUIPMENT		
42.01	Non-expendable equipment (1 PC)		8 000
50	MISCELLANEOUS		
51.01	Manual (editing/publishing)		10 000
52.01	Preparation of data diskettes		9 000
99	TOTAL		227 000

UNITED
NATIONS

TD

United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development

Distr.
GENERAL

TD/B/C.5/130
5 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Special Committee on Preferences
Seventeenth Session
Geneva, 14 May 1990
Item 3 of the provisional agenda

Comprehensive review of the generalized system of preferences, including its implementation, maintenance, improvement and utilization

Report by the UNCTAD secretariat

GE.90-50518/1674B

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs
	Introduction and summary	1 - 5
Part one:	Background	6 - 36
Chapter		
I.	Changes and improvements in the system in 1989/90	6 - 36
	A. Introduction	6
	B. Beneficiaries	7 - 9
	C. Product coverage	10 - 13
	D. Tariff cuts	14 - 17
	E. Safeguards	18 - 25
	F. Rules of origin	26 - 30
	G. Least developed countries	31 - 36
Part two:	Comprehensive review of the generalized system of preferences in the 1980s	37 - 84
Chapter		
I.	Evolution of the generalized system of preferences	37 - 61
	A. Beneficiaries	39 - 47
	B. Safeguard mechanisms and other limitations and exclusions	48 - 53
	C. Product coverage	54
	D. Depth of tariff cut	55
	E. Rules of origin	56
	F. Least developed countries	57 - 61
II.	Actual and potential significance of the GSP for the trade of developing countries	62 - 70
	A. The situation during the 1980s	62 - 67
	B. Potential impact of expanding product coverage	68 - 70
III.	Improving the GSP in the 1990s	71 - 84
	A. Non-tariff measures and effective access to GSP benefits	74
	B. The relationship between product coverage, exclusions and safeguards	75 - 81
	C. Improving the depth of tariff cut, rules of origin and provisions for least developed countries	82 - 84

Annex

Tables

1. Imports of preference-giving countries from beneficiaries of their schemes, 1976-1988

2. Imports into selected DMECs of products excluded from their respective GSP schemes in 1986

3. Imports into developed market-economy countries of products excluded from their respective schemes, from individual beneficiary in 1986

4. Beneficiaries of the schemes of generalized preferences

SURVEY OF THE QUALITY AND USEFULNESS OF UNCTAD PUBLICATIONS AND OF THEIR END-USERS

The UNCTAD secretariat, in the context of its programme evaluation activities and in response to intergovernmental requests, is seeking the opinions of end-users in order to have basic data for assessing the quality, usefulness and effectiveness of *inter alia* its research reports and publications. As the success of such an exercise is critically dependent on an adequate rate of response we should appreciate it if you would take time to answer the questions below and submit any other comments that you may have concerning the current document.

1. **Title or symbol number of document** . . . . . .

2. **When did you receive the document?** . . . . . .

3. **How did you receive the document?** *(tick one or more boxes)*

Through Permanent Mission to United Nations	( )	From UN bookshop	( )
From ministry or government office	( )	From university libraries	( )
Directly from UNCTAD secretariat	( )	Own request	( )
By participating in an UN/UNCTAD intergovernmental meeting	( )	UNCTAD initiative	( )
		Other (please specify)	. . . . .
By participating in an UN/UNCTAD sponsored training course or seminar	( )	. . . . .	
		. . . . .	

4. **For what main purposes do you use the document?** *(tick one or more boxes)*

Policy formulation	( )	Education and training	( )
Analysis and research	( )	Management	( )
Legislation	( )	Other (please specify)	. . . . .
Background information	( )	. . . . .	

5. **How do you rate the document as regards:**

Its usefulness to your work *(tick one box)*

Extremely useful ( ); Very useful ( ); Useful ( ); Marginally useful ( ); Not at all ( ).

Its quality, in terms of the following aspects *(tick one box in each case)*:

	Outstanding	*Excellent*	*Good*	*Adequate*	*Poor*
Presentation and readability	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Originality of ideas	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Wealth of information	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Up-to-date information	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Technical accuracy	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Quality of analysis, including objectivity	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Validity of conclusions	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Clarity of recommendations	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comprehensiveness of coverage	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

6. **Other observations** *(if any)* . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Finally, we would appreciate it if you could provide the following information about yourself:

Name . . . . . .Occupation/Functional title . . . . . .

Address . . . . . .

Your answers are for internal use and will be kept confidential. Thank you for your co-operation.

Please forward the questionnaire to : PROGRAMME CO-ORDINATION AND EVALUATION UNIT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT
PALAIS DES NATIONS – CH-1211 GENEVA 10

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1. Resolution 6 (IX) of Special Committee on Preferences called for a comprehensive review of the Generalized System of Preferences in 1990. The timing of this second comprehensive review is appropriate since the second decade of the operation of the individual schemes terminates in the period 1991-1993 and decisions requiring their extension must soon be taken.

2. This report provides the basic background material for the comprehensive review. It draws heavily on the documentation prepared for the sixteenth session of the Special Committee on Preferences in 1989, which analysed changes in the GSP since its inception. 1/

3. Part one highlights the changes and improvements in the system since that session. It replaces the general report on the implementation of the Generalized System of Preferences which is presented to the annual sessions of the Special Committee under agenda item 3.

4. Part two provides materials required to undertake the comprehensive review of the Generalized System of Preferences 1979-1989. Chapter I discusses the evolution of the GSP since the last comprehensive review in 1979. It reviews the actual experience with the GSP over the past 10 years and provides an indication of the problems and shortcomings of the system, by major element. Chapter II examines the actual and potential trade effects of the GSP and assesses the trade implications of an expanded product coverage on both beneficiaries and preference-giving countries. Chapter III examines the interdependent nature of some of the elements of the GSP and suggests possible avenues for improving the schemes which recognize these interrelationships.

5. The report argues that the GSP has not yet achieved its objectives and has only a minor but positive impact on growth and industrialization in developing countries. An improved GSP could provide an important stimulus in those countries where non-traditional export supply capabilities are emerging. The GSP therefore needs to be extended during the 1990s, and preference-giving countries may wish to consider possible improvements in their autonomous schemes to bring them more into line with the basic principles underlying the GSP. Improvements which deserve attention include: (i) action to deal with non-tariff measures which effectively impede access to GSP benefits; (ii) expansion of the product coverage; (iii) adoption of a general safeguard provision with multilaterally agreed objectives and transparent criteria for injury determination; (iv) elimination of currently applied country exclusions; (v) elimination of the practice of product-country exclusions or if such elimination is not possible, elaboration of objective and transparent multilaterally agreed norms for such exclusions; (vi) improvement of preference margins; (vii) simplification and harmonization of rules of origin; and (viii) improvements in the provisions for least developed countries.

Part one

BACKGROUND

Chapter I

CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SYSTEM IN 1989/90

A. Introduction

6. This chapter briefly summarizes the modifications in the GSP schemes since the sixteenth session of the Special Committee, held in April 1989. Details of such changes and improvements are based on official notifications to UNCTAD by preference-giving countries and are presented according to the common elements of the GSP to which they pertain.

B. Beneficiaries 2/

7. From 1 January 1990, Austria added Poland and the "occupied Palestinian territories" to its list of beneficiaries. Canada granted beneficiary status to Hungary and Poland from 1 December 1989. On 1 January 1990, EEC 3/ added Hungary and Poland to the list of beneficiaries. Additionally, these two countries, along with Cuba and El Salvador, were added to the list of beneficiaries of the EEC MFA textile régime. It should also be noted that the Republic of Korea is still suspended, on a temporary basis, as a beneficiary under the EEC scheme of 1990.

8. Finland added Macau to its list of beneficiaries on 1 January 1988 and Netherlands Antilles on 1 January 1989. Japan added Poland to its list of beneficiaries on 1 January 1990. Poland added Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to its list of beneficiaries and deleted Bermuda and Puerto Rico as from 1 January 1989.

9. The United States granted beneficiary status to Hungary in November 1989 and Poland from January 1990. Burma and the Central African Republic were suspended indefinitely from its scheme on 1 July 1989. These suspensions resulted from allegations made by labour and human rights groups that these two countries did not accord their citizens internationally recognized human rights. As a result of new agreements to provide more favourable preferential treatment than GSP to the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, the United States withdrew beneficiary status from both these on 18 October 1989.

C. Product coverage

10. On 1 July 1989, Austria added 14 agricultural products 4/ to the list of goods eligible for preferences under its scheme and, with effect from 1 January 1990, it removed two items. 5/ The EEC added 23 new agricultural products, 8 of which are treated in a specific GSP regulation and subjected to global fixed reduced levy amounts. Following the Montreal decision on tropical products in the context of the Uruguay Round, the EEC deleted 27 agricultural products from the GSP, since the MFN treatment on these products is either equal to or better than the actual GSP treatment.

Following the conversion of its national tariff to the Harmonized System on 1 January 1989, Finland added 30 industrial items to its list of goods eligible for GSP. Additionally, as a result of concessions made in the Uruguay Round, two tropical products 6/ were deleted from the list of products not eligible for preferential treatment on 1 July 1989. An additional item 7/ was also deleted from GSP eligibility.

11. As from 1 April 1989, Japan added two agricultural products 8/ to its positive list. Norway added eight agricultural products 9/ with effect from 1 July 1989. With Poland's decision to add 28 tropical agricultural products 10/ and 21 tropical industrial products 11/ to the list of goods eligible for preferences under its revised scheme on 1 January 1989, all dutiable products imported from beneficiaries are now covered under the scheme of Poland.

12. As a result of the advanced implementation of tariff reductions on certain tropical products agreed at the GATT ministerial meeting of December 1988, Switzerland added, with effect from 1 July 1989, 22 agricultural products 12/ to the list of goods eligible for preferences under its scheme. These additions included products such as crude and crystallized sugar, which are of special export interest to several beneficiary countries. This measure is only of a provisional character and will be reviewed at the end of the present round of negotiations.

13. The United States added nine products 13/ to the GSP programme on 1 July 1989, in response to requests from both beneficiary countries and the private sector, and deleted one product 14/ as a result of petitions filed by United States industry or trade associations.

D. Tariff cuts

14. As from 1 July 1989 and in accordance with the tariff reductions on tropical products agreed in the multilateral trade negotiations in the context of the Uruguay Round, Austria implemented MFN tariff reductions on agricultural and non-agricultural products and, in the context of its GSP, provided GSP margin on 48 agricultural items and reduced GSP rates for 5 other products to zero. In the case of 35 industrial and 7 textile products, both considered as tropical products, the formula for calculating the tariff cut under the Austrian scheme (75 per cent for industrial items, 50 per cent for textiles) was applied to the reduced MFN rates. For some 1,800 tariff lines in the industrial sector (tariff chapters 25-97) the generally applicable rates of duty were temporarily reduced in advance of the final results of the multilateral trade negotiations in GATT. Since these reduced rates will be taken as base rates for calculating the unchanged preferential margin under the Austrian GSP scheme, the preferential tariff rates will be reduced accordingly.

15. Czechoslovakia granted zero preferential duty to 64 agricultural and 58 industrial products. It also provided an 85 per cent reduction (instead of 75 per cent) of MFN rates on 22 agricultural and 24 industrial products. As a result of a new Czech law, only five products 15/ (at the six-digit level of the HS) are now excluded from the GSP scheme.

16. In 1990, the EEC increased preferential margins in the case of six agricultural products. Eight agricultural products added within a new GSP regulation were granted a 50 per cent reduction of the levies imposed on them.

17. With the introduction of its revised scheme on 1 January 1989, Poland increased the preferential margin on 114 agricultural and 86 industrial products. Consequently, preferential rates are now harmonized at 30 per cent of the MFN rate of duty for all products. However, for 247 tropical products, as defined at the six-digit level of the HS, preferential duty-free rates are granted. Switzerland reduced duties on eight agricultural products and accorded zero GSP rates to another two items on 1 July 1989.

E. Safeguards

18. In 1990, limitations on preferential access under the system of duty-free amounts (FDFA) were extended by the EEC to all sensitive industrial products other than ECSC products and textile products, when exported by a beneficiary defined by the EEC as "ultra competitive". Additionally the administration of two FDFAs has been tightened by splitting the annual amount into two tranches of six months duration each.

19. Five tariff quotas, which applied to sensitive agricultural products, were abolished and replaced by global, annual fixed reduced levy amounts. The EEC also added four items to the list of sensitive industrial products in 1990. Some 22 individual beneficiaries are now affected by the FDFA. The level of the FDFA and/or tariff ceilings for two thirds of the sensitive products, has been generally increased by 5 per cent with unchanged levels for the remaining one third. In the context of a differentiation policy, six products have been excluded when exported by Saudi Arabia, which is considered an "ultra-competitive" supplier. In addition, four individual FDFAs have been reduced by half in respect to the Republic of Korea (although it is currently suspended from the scheme).

20. In 1970, the EEC began applying its "new phase of differentiation". In this connection, four textile products not subject to the Multi-Fibre Arrangement (MFA) imported from Brazil were excluded from the GSP. For the first time, the EEC applied differentiation criteria adopted in 1987 to textiles subject to the MFA. Under this policy, it applied a 50 per cent reduction of preferential amounts to two products exported by China and one product exported by Brazil, Mexico and the Republic of Korea, respectively. Furthermore, the EEC increased its differentiation among beneficiaries by reducing by 50 per cent the preferential amounts opened to "dominant suppliers" and State-trading countries in eight categories of products subject to the MFA.

21. Regarding administration of 14 tariff quotas opened under the MFA, the amount normally allocated annually has been split into two six-month tranches. For these products, returns to the Community reserve were previously not required, but now when 80 per cent of the tariff quota of member States in each semester has been used the remainder must be returned to the Community reserve. Other products subject to annual tariff quotas must also comply with this rule.

22. In fiscal year 1989, some 145 product groups under the scheme of Japan were subject to the administration of ceilings. 16/ Ceilings on 39 of these product groups were increased, either by 6 per cent or 3 per cent. The ceiling for batik woven fabrics of cotton (HS 52.08) increased by nearly threefold and that for non-alloy pig iron (HS ex 72.01) and carpets, etc. (HS 57.01) by 11 per cent and 1 per cent, respectively. Imports of woven fabrics of corded wool (product group 67), which were previously subject to daily control, are now administered under the monthly control system.

23. Since 1985, New Zealand has excluded countries from its GSP scheme as soon as they reach a per capita GNP level equal to 70 per cent of its own. On 1 July 1989, Israel was excluded under this provision, while the GSP status of Trinidad and Tobago was reinstated. As from 1 July 1989, New Zealand introduced a new exclusion criterion according to which developing countries would no longer be accorded tariff preferences with respect to individual tariff items when their exports of those items to New Zealand exceeded benchmark levels of 25 per cent of total imports of the items in question and a value of $NZ 100,000. As of December 1989, a total of 147 tariff items involving 12 countries had been affected. However, there is a procedure for reinstatement of GSP treatment if imports do not meet the criteria for exclusion in two consecutive years. Furthermore, the following categories of products are exempted from product graduation: (a) medicaments and pharmaceutical preparations 17/ and goods not made in New Zealand; 18/ (b) tariff items for which the GSP rate is free and the MFN rate is 5 per cent; (c) goods for which a specific margin of preference is set down in a bilateral trade agreement with New Zealand.

24. With effect from 1 July 1989, the United States made the following changes: (a) Mexico was excluded with respect to one product 19/ the imports of which were valued at $US 1.4 million; (b) the competitive need limits were waived for one product 20/ when imported from Mexico; (c) Bahamas 21/ and Turkey 22/ were redesignated for GSP benefits with respect to two products 23/ for which they were previously excluded on account of competitive need limits; 24/ (d) as a result of the de minimis provision 25/, imports of some 87 products valued at $150.4 million became eligible for preferences.

25. Following the annual product review, competitive need exclusions amounted to approximately $6.2 billion (based on 1988 trade), as compared to $22.5 billion one year earlier. Of these $6.2 billion, $216.3 million consisted of trade in items for which beneficiaries lost eligibility for the first time. As from 1 July 1989, 383 TSUS items were removed from the scheme because of the competitive need exclusions. Altogether 335 of these items were excluded in respect of only one beneficiary. The most affected beneficiaries (ranked according to frequency of exclusion) were Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Israel, Bahamas, Thailand, Peru, Zambia, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Colombia.

F. Rules of origin

26. As from 1 January 1988, Austria increased the value limit for small consignments of a non-commercial nature from Austrian shillings AS3,000 to AS5,000 and the value limit for travellers' baggage from AS10,000 to AS13,000. With respect to the new general rules of origin, 26/ Austria

formalized rules for issuing replacement certificates by introducing a new paragraph under rule 12 of the rules of origin which are currently applied to its scheme.

27. Without altering the common rules of origin applied under the schemes of the Eastern European preference-giving countries, with effect from 1 July 1989, Czechoslovakia revised its rules of origin through adoption of more accurate definitions and/or (formalization of certain rules as follows: 27/ (i) preferences are granted to "the country in which the firm exporting the merchandise (the exporter) is registered"; 28/ (ii) several elements pertaining to the rules of origin formalization of the list of wholly obtained products, definition of value of goods, presentation of certificate of origin, Form A and of the manner in which this form is to be completed, and formalization of the granting of preferences to products imported at the time of an exhibition or fair) were defined.

28. Following the last outstanding notification by the ASEAN secretariat to the EC Commission, as from 17 November 1989, the regional cumulation rules granted by the EEC to the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) were put into effect.

29. With effect from 1 January 1989, Finland added introductory notes to the combined list which superseded previous Lists A and B. These introductory notes give definitions and more explanations of how to use the list. 29/

30. With effect from 1 January 1990, Japan terminated the transitional arrangements concerning optional completion of "box 8" of the certificate of origin "Form A". Henceforth, the HS heading at the four-digit level must be entered into "box 8" of "Form A" as a general rule.

G. Least developed countries (LDCs)

31. As a result of the implementation of tariff reductions agreed to in the multilateral trade negotiations in the context of the Uruguay Round, with effect from 1 July 1989, Austria made deeper duty reductions (75 per cent tariff cut, instead of 50 per cent) with respect to nine textile products for the benefit of the least developed countries.

32. Czechoslovakia added Myanmar, Malawi, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Somalia, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Zambia, Kiribati and Mozambique to its list of LDCs. It should be noted that the last two countries have been extended preferences under the Czech GSP scheme for the first time.

33. As from 1 January 1989, Finland added Myanmar to the list of LDCs and included two more items 30/ in the list of covered products for their exclusive benefit. With effect from 1 July 1989, Kiribati, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tuvalu and Vanuatu were included in its list of LDCs and preferential benefits were extended to one product 31/ in favour of these beneficiaries.

34. As from 1 April 1989, Japan added Mozambique to its list of LDCs and eliminated the two exceptions with respect to ceilings which were still applicable to LDCs. As a result, duty-free and ceiling-free tariff treatment is now granted to LDCs with respect to all products covered by the Japanese GSP scheme.

35. The product exclusion system under the New Zealand GSP scheme does not apply to LDCs, to which further benefits have been extended. Items originating in LDCs subject to duty have been granted duty-free status, except those which are subject to duty because of decisions taken in the context of official industry development plants.

36. As from 1 January 1989, Poland added Myanmar, Kiribati, Mauritania, Mozambique, Tuvalu and Vanuatu to its list of LDCs. With effect from 1 July 1989, Switzerland added Mozambique and Vanuatu to its list of LDCs. In addition, Switzerland extended preferences to eight agricultural products 32/ for the exclusive benefit of the LDCs.

Part two

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES IN THE 1980s

Chapter I

EVOLUTION OF THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

37. The GSP has brought considerable trade benefits to developing countries during the decade of the 1980s. However, the evolution of the system has not been favourable in all respects. There have been tendencies in some major preference-giving countries to exclude countries from benefits on a unilateral basis. Limits to preferential treatment through various mechanisms have proliferated. Non-tariff measures outside the GSP have also limited effective access to preferential treatment. The rules of origin continue to be complex and different from scheme to scheme, discouraging the utilization of the system, particularly by least developed and other low-income countries. On the other hand, there have been positive developments. In most schemes, product coverage has been expanded, and provisions for the least developed countries have tended to improve.

38. This chapter briefly reviews the actual experience with the GSP over the past 10 years and provides an indication of the problems and shortcomings of the system, by major element. While recognizing that the six elements common to all GSP schemes are interrelated, they are treated separately here for expository purposes. 33/

A. Beneficiaries

39. In the absence of generally acceptable objective criteria for a definition of a developing country, GSP beneficiary status is granted at the discretion of the preference-giving countries. Preference-giving countries generally rely on the principle of "self-election" and consider petitions for preferential treatment coming from any country or territory requesting beneficiary status. At present, nearly all countries members of the Group of 77 are recognized as beneficiaries in most schemes, as are certain territories and countries non-members of the Group of 77, including Albania, Bulgaria, China, Hong Kong, Hungary, Israel, Mongolia, Oman, Nauru, Taiwan Province of China, Turkey and some others. Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland although preference-giving countries are preference-receiving countries under some schemes. Least developed countries (LDCs) receive special and more favourable treatment than other beneficiaries under almost all the schemes. Though the United Nations recognizes at present 42 LDCs, each preference-giving country, using the United Nations list as a broad basis, has drawn up its own list of LDCs. Since the introduction of the schemes, there have been significant increases in the number of beneficiaries and very few deletions. 34/

40. In each of the schemes, however, the number of beneficiaries has varied over time, and some beneficiaries have been excluded from GSP treatment. In some schemes specific groups of developing countries receive more favourable treatment than other countries.

41. In the recent past, an increasing number of beneficiaries have been losing beneficiary status. A country can be excluded from preferential treatment for many reasons differently defined under the individual schemes, including per capita income, competitiveness (as defined by the preference-giving country), general conduct in international trade, and by executive discretion, or on other grounds unrelated to international trade.

42. For example, in the United States scheme a number of countries have been partially or totally excluded from preferential treatment during the last decade for various reasons. Four beneficiaries (Bahrain, Bermuda, Brunei Darussalam, Nauru) have lost beneficiary status because they exceeded a per capita income level established as a ceiling in 1985; six countries (Romania, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Chile, the Republic of Myanmar, the Central African Republic) have been excluded from the scheme because the United States determined that "recognized workers' rights" were being violated by these countries; four economies (Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Taiwan Province of China) were graduated because of their "high levels of economic development and trade competitiveness"; one country (Thailand) was removed from beneficiary status with respect to some products because of its "lack of effective protection of United States intellectual property rights"; one other country (Panama) was partially excluded because it did not take action to "prevent illegal drugs from entering the United States"; and three countries (Laos, Afghanistan, Ethiopia) have been excluded because of "failure to compensate for nationalization of American property".

43. Since its inception, the GSP scheme of the EEC has provided differential treatment for beneficiary countries depending on their competitiveness, as perceived by the EEC, with respect to specific categories of products and depending on the import sensitivity of these products in the EEC market. The scheme for 1990 provides for four different régimes (industrial products, agricultural products, textile products, and steel products). Although in theory the list of beneficiaries remains the same for all régimes, in practice a country enjoys different preferential treatment depending on its competitive position with regard to each régime as well as with respect to specific products within each régime. In the textile sector, the differentiation among beneficiaries is even more marked, as only the countries (33 in number in 1990) which have signed bilateral agreements with the EEC under the MFA providing for quantitative limitation of their exports to the Community enjoy duty-free entry.

44. The number of beneficiaries under the scheme of New Zealand has also been subject to modifications. As already noted, countries whose per capita income exceeds 70 per cent of that of New Zealand have been excluded from GSP benefits by New Zealand since 1985. Up to the end of 1989, 20 preference-receiving countries lost beneficiary status due to the application of this country graduation policy. Recently (July 1989) New Zealand introduced a product exclusion policy, thus introducing differentiation in beneficiary status with respect to product coverage.

45. Aside from their GSP schemes, some preference-giving countries offer to selected developing countries special preferential arrangements which are usually more generous than the GSP and which often cover non-trade-related areas. Over the past decade, the EEC has offered privileged status to African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries under the Lomé Conventions.

When the Lomé IV Convention enters into force (in March 1990), 69 ACP developing countries will receive beneficiary status under the arrangement. Since January 1984, the United States has offered special treatment to 27 developing countries under the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI). Canada offers two preferential schemes of export interest to certain specified developing countries: the British Preferential Tariff, which is granted to 66 member countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and Caribcan preferences, which are available to 18 Commonwealth Caribbean States. Australia and New Zealand provide special treatment to South Pacific Forum island countries under the Sparteca agreement. Thus, developing countries enjoying such special preferential treatment are only nominal beneficiaries of the GSP of the preference-giving countries which grant such special preferences.

46. Recently, some socialist countries of Eastern Europe, which are also preference-giving countries, have become beneficiaries of the schemes of some preference-giving countries. Hungary has been granted GSP status by New Zealand (1985), Japan (1986), Austria (1988), the United States (1989) and the EEC (1990), and Poland by New Zealand (1986), Canada (1989), EEC (1990), Japan (1990) and the United States (1990). Other OECD countries are evaluating the possibility of including Poland and Hungary in their schemes. Notwithstanding the economic difficulties that Hungary and Poland are facing at the moment, their production and export capabilities are better matched to GSP product coverage than those of many other beneficiaries, thus placing them in a good position to enjoy GSP benefits.

47. The practice of excluding countries from GSP benefits has proliferated in the 1980s. In this connection, it should be noted that the international community has not agreed on exclusion criteria, and that such criteria have been adopted unilaterally by preference-giving countries. The criteria used have been, in several instances, of a non-economic nature, or have violated the principles of non-discrimination and non-reciprocity accepted as guides for the GSP. Moreover, application of unilateral and often shifting criteria has rendered the system unstable and has reduced its value to preference-receiving countries. Even apparently objective criteria for "graduation" have shortcomings. For example, while high per capita GNP may appear to be objective grounds for excluding a country from GSP benefits, such a country may not have succeeded in developing a strong and diversified industrial base (as is the case with some relatively high income oil-exporting countries), which is, after all, one of the principal objectives of the GSP.

B. Safeguard mechanisms and other limitations and exclusions

48. Limitations on access to benefits have become entrenched in a number of schemes. This is perhaps the area where the GSP schemes have had their greatest weakness. Unilateral limits on access to GSP benefit and the lack of transparency in the implementation of safeguards and other limitations have resulted in considerable uncertainty for developing country exporters.

49. Safeguard mechanisms and limitations take several forms under the various schemes. Most schemes contain a general safeguard mechanism under which preference-giving countries reserve the right to exclude or limit GSP imports

which are found to cause, or to threaten to cause, injury to domestic industries. Other kinds of limitations are widespread in some schemes, including those of the EEC, United States, Japan and New Zealand.

50. In the case of EEC, a priori quantitative limitations apply to most of the products included in the scheme. Limitations apply with more or less severity, depending upon the sensitivity of the products and the competitiveness of the suppliers as determined by the EEC. Even though some modifications in this regard have been introduced in the scheme since its inception, they have not altered the essential structure of the system. Limitations have taken the form of tariff quotas set for each EEC member State, tariff ceilings for the Community as a whole or, more recently, fixed duty-free amounts (FDFA) which are directly administered by the Commission.

51. The United States has established a system of limitations which it applies to all GSP covered products. "Competitive need criteria" provide for the withdrawal of preferential treatment when imports of a particular product from a particular beneficiary exceed 50 per cent of total United States imports of that product or a certain dollar value, which is adjusted annually to reflect the growth of nominal United States GSP. 35/ The 50 per cent limit does not apply where a similar or directly competitive product is not produced in the United States. Under a de minimis provision, the 50 per cent rule may also be waived where United States imports of a product are less than a certain amount, which is also adjusted annually to reflect changes in nominal GNP. Through its annual review procedures, the United States scheme also provides a means by which products can be added or removed from the scheme when requested by domestic interests. As a result of the application of competitive need limitations 15 beneficiaries (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Hong Kong, Israel, India, Mexico, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Taiwan Province of China, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia) have been excluded from duty-free treatment on a total of 445 tariff items (at the eight digit level).

52. Since its inception, the scheme of Japan has made provision for quantitative limitations on preferential imports which have been liberalized over the past decade. A priori limitations (ceilings) now apply in respect of about half of the industrial products covered by the scheme. Products are divided into a certain number of product groups the scope of which depends on their import sensitivity. Maximum country amounts of 25 per cent apply to these ceiling. Ceilings and maximum country amounts are administered on a first-come first-served basis subject to daily control, monthly control, or prior allotment. Imports which do not pose a threat of injury to Japan's industry are subject to flexible administration, which allows preferential treatment to continue after the quantitative limits have been exceeded.

53. Since the inception of the system, preference-giving countries have reserved the right to resort to the safeguard mechanisms to retain some degree of control over the trade which is generated by the tariff advantages. However, preference-giving countries have resorted mostly to country- and product-specific limitation on access to GSP benefits, which tend to become entrenched, rather than to safeguard actions, which, by their very nature, are supposed to be temporary expedients to allow domestic producers to adjust to surges in imports resulting from the GSP.

C. Product coverage

54. Although there have been extensions of product coverage in a number of schemes - particularly those of Austria, Australia, EEC, New Zealand, Poland and the United States - these have been rather modest. Recent changes and improvements with respect to product coverage have not been as important as those witnessed in the first 10-year period of operation of the GSP, nor have they modified substantially the nature and the scope of the GSP, which continues to be heavily concentrated on industrial products and has rather limited coverage for agricultural and other traditional products.

D. Depth of tariff cut

55. The depth of tariff cuts has tended to increase over the years under those schemes which did not grant total duty-free treatment from the outset. However, the extension of duty-free entry to all industrial products and deeper tariff cuts for agricultural products have not yet offset the erosion of GSP margins as a result of MFN tariff cuts agreed to in the multilateral trade negotiations in the Tokyo Round, and this may be further accentuated by those anticipated in the Uruguay Round.

E. Rules of origin

56. In spite of certain improvements and simplifications in several schemes, the rules of origin remain widely disparate and complex. 36/ The dichotomy in the definition of "substantial transformation" between the process criterion (change in the four-digit HS heading) and the percentage criterion (minimum percentage of domestic value added or maximum percentage of imported inputs) continues to create difficulties for beneficiaries in realizing the maximum benefits of the various GSP schemes. These difficulties are particularly serious for the least developed and other low-income countries, where complex and stringent rules of origin have been an impediment to fuller utilization of the GSP.

F. Least developed countries (LDCs)

57. Since the outset of discussions on the introduction of the GSP, there has been agreement that special measures should be introduced on behalf of the LDCs. Accordingly, most preference-giving countries have adopted various measures in favour of the LDCs in the framework of the GSP.

58. On the basis of the United Nations list of least developed countries, preference-giving countries have drawn up their own lists: in certain cases a more limited number of beneficiaries qualify for special treatment (Canada, Norway and Sweden include in their lists 41 countries, New Zealand 40, Japan 38, Finland 37, Poland and Hungary 36, Bulgaria 33, United States and Czechoslovakia 32). In others, slight differences in the designation of beneficiaries apply (Austria, EEC). Up to now only one preference-giving country (Switzerland) grants special LDC treatment to the 42 countries as designated by the United Nations.

59. From the beginning, the special concessions granted to least developed countries in the framework of the GSP have varied from one preference-giving country to another in relation to all the main elements of the system (coverage, depth of tariff cuts, quantitative limitations, rules of origin). As far as the product coverage is concerned, some preference-giving countries (Norway, Sweden, Bulgaria and Hungary) provide full coverage for all products (Chapters 1-97 of the Harmonized System). Other preference-giving countries provide extended coverage for LDCs, while in other schemes the product coverage remains the same for all beneficiaries.

60. Duty-free entry is usually granted on the products covered by the scheme, with the exception of a few preference-giving countries (Austria, New Zealand and Switzerland), which apply only a partial cut in the MFN rate of duty. With very few exceptions, no quantitative limitations on preferential imports apply to LDCs. Except for Canada and the EEC, no other preference-giving country accords special measures in favour of the least developed countries in the area of the rules of origin.

61. The least developed countries have not been able to take full advantage of GSP benefits. The lack of specific measures in some schemes, the exclusion of certain products of export interest to them, very limited special provisions regarding rules of origin, difficulties in the full understanding of the system, and frequent changes in individual schemes are among the reasons which have prevented the GSP from being more meaningful to the least developed countries.

Chapter II

ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GSP FOR THE TRADE OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

A. The situation during the 1980s

62. The growing complexity of several GSP schemes, particularly those of the largest trading partners of developing countries, and the increasing resort to non-tariff measures, render difficult an assessment of the extent to which imports from developing countries have benefited from preferential treatment. However, one indicator - the ratio of preferential to dutiable imports - provides a crude first approximation to the extent to which the GSP schemes provide preferential access to markets for exports from developing countries. For example, if this ratio were 100 per cent, it would indicate that all dutiable imports from preference-receiving countries are benefiting from preferences. The way in which this ratio varied over the 1980s also provides a concise measurement of the extent to which the GSP schemes were, in practice, liberalized or made more restrictive.

63. The ratio of preferential to dutiable imports can be decomposed into two components: (1) the "coverage ratio" (imports covered under the GSP schemes divided by dutiable imports), and (2) the "utilization ratio" (preferential imports divided by covered imports). The coverage ratio measures the extent to which export products from beneficiaries to preference-giving countries are eligible for preferential treatment. The utilization ratio measures the extent to which beneficiaries actually make use of the schemes. Utilization ratios are less than 100 per cent for various reasons: as already noted above, the restrictions and limitations on access to GSP benefits for sensitive products contained in most GSP schemes, the introduction of country- and product-specific exclusions, stringent rules of origin, and lack of familiarity on the part of preference-receiving countries with the operation of the GSP schemes.

64. As can be seen in annex table 1, for all OECD preference-giving countries, both preferential and dutiable imports roughly doubled in the period 1980-1987. Incomplete information indicates that preferential imports into OECD preference-giving countries could have reached about $55 billion in 1988. Data for 1989 are still unavailable, but the exclusion from GSP benefits by the United States of four large exporters of manufactures (Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea, Singapore and Taiwan, Province of China) is likely to have led to a sharp fall in preferential imports to OECD countries (perhaps to around $50 billion). Preferential imports represent between one fifth and one quarter of all dutiable imports, a ratio which experienced little variation during the 1980s. This means that there is considerable room for improvement in the GSP schemes, with regard to both product coverage and the extent to which preference-receiving countries have access to benefits on products covered by the schemes.

65. The rough constancy in the ratio of preferential to dutiable imports is the result of two opposite trends: on the one hand, product coverage has risen; on the other, utilization ratios have tended to fall somewhat, probably largely as a consequence of the increasing restrictiveness of the larger schemes.

66. Practically all schemes show a tendency towards widening of product coverage. This is particularly true in the case of the EEC, Finland, Norway, Switzerland and the United States. As regards utilization rates, the growing use of competitive need limits and country-product exclusions were the major factors behind the drastic fall in the United States' utilization rate from 51 per cent in 1980 to 37 per cent in 1987. This decline explains to a large extent the fall in the utilization rate for the OECD countries as a whole. The utilization rate also declined considerably in Canada; by contrast, a significant improvement was registered in Austria.

67. The ratio of preferential to dutiable imports is an imperfect indicator of the extent to which the GSP schemes provide preferential access to markets for developing country exports. On the one hand, as already noted, the imports of an increasing number of products on which beneficiaries nominally enjoy preferences are limited by non-tariff barriers. On the other hand, the very manner in which the ratio is calculated (i.e., by completely excluding non-beneficiaries) tends to make it a less useful indicator than it might seem on first inspection. When a country is excluded completely from a scheme, both the denominator and the numerator of the ratio are affected. In the case of the United States, the elimination of four large exporters from its GSP scheme in 1989 is likely to have led to increases in the recorded utilization rate and in the ratio of preferential to dutiable imports, since these economies' exports to the United States were among those most severely affected by competitive and other limitations. Although the data for 1989 on imports from GSP beneficiaries are not yet available, it is estimated that the exclusion of these economies from the list of GSP beneficiaries will have resulted in a fall in preferential imports into the United States of about $6 billion. Dutiable imports from GSP beneficiaries are likely to have fallen by over $50 billion in 1989 as a consequence of these exclusions. Other things being equal, these exclusions would have caused the ratio of preferential to dutiable imports to rise from 15 per cent in 1988 to around 25 per cent in 1989, even though the scheme of the United States did in fact become considerably more restrictive.

B. Potential impact of expanding product coverage

68. The foregoing analysis indicates that expanding product coverage could significantly enhance the benefits that developing countries derive from the GSP. An analysis of excluded MFN dutiable products, based on trade data shown in annex table 2, reveals that imports of such products into 10 OECD preference-giving countries in 1986 amounted to $31.3 billion, or nearly 35 per cent of total dutiable imports from beneficiaries. 37/ Four GSP schemes (Canada, EEC, Japan and the United States) accounted for 94.4 per cent of imports of products excluded. Excluded industrial products accounted for two thirds ($20.5 billion) of these total excluded imports, and excluded agricultural products for the remaining one third ($10.7 billion). In Austria, EEC, Japan, Finland and Switzerland, excluded agricultural products accounted for the largest share of total excluded imports (between 60 per cent and almost 100 per cent). In Canada, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand and the United States, industrial products were by far the most important items among excluded products.

69. A total number of 142 beneficiaries were affected by the exclusions. Among these, the least developed countries account for only 2 per cent of excluded products (see annex table 3). There is a strong case for allowing preferences to least developed countries in these excluded products, as such preferential access will hardly have any adverse impact on the domestic industries of the preference-giving countries.

70. In fact, since a very large number of developing countries have export supply capabilities mainly in products which are at present excluded from the GSP schemes, the benefits of GSP will continue to be limited if the product coverage under various schemes does not significantly expand to include as many of these products as possible.

Chapter III

IMPROVING THE GSP IN THE 1990s

71. The foregoing chapter showed some evidence that the GSP has been an important instrument of multilateral trade policy. Preferential imports rose rapidly over the 1980s. The impact of the GSP on exports, investment, and output in beneficiary countries is not easy to assess, since it requires the estimation of what the value of those variables would have been in the absence of preferential margins. Surveying the available literature and studies commissioned by UNCTAD over the past few years, a recent study comes to the conclusion that, excluding dynamic effects via stimulating export-oriented investment, the GSP could have been responsible for an increase of $1-4 billion in the annual exports of developing countries in the post-Tokyo Round period. 38/ This is equivalent to roughly 1 to 4 per cent of the average exports of manufactures from developing countries to developed market economies over the period 1980-1987. Another study for 1983 yields a somewhat higher estimate: as a result of the GSP, imports by 20 preference-giving OECD countries and Hungary are estimated to have been some $6 billion (or approximately 7.5 per cent of manufacturing exports of developing countries) higher than they would have been in the absence of preferences. 39/ These estimates are small but significant. For some countries, estimates of the impact of the GSP on exports of manufactures are considerably larger. There is also evidence that the GSP has had dynamic effects, in the form of encouragement to investment in export-oriented production. In countries that have export-oriented economies, such effects could have been far from negligible. For example, a study for Malaysia concluded that the effect of the GSP on investment might be in excess of 2 per cent of GDP. 40/

72. Therefore, while the GSP has had a small impact on growth and industrialization, the impact has been positive, and it can be said that the GSP has had a role to play in moving developing countries closer to the objectives of the system, particularly contributing to industrialization, increased export earnings and growth. It is also obvious that these objectives have not been accomplished: only very few developing countries are significant exporters of manufactures. In fact, the vast majority of developing countries have made little headway in their industrialization and have yet to develop a presence in international markets for manufactures. For these countries the GSP can be particularly important in stimulating the diversification of their exports and production structures.

73. For these reasons, the GSP needs to be extended during the 1990s. At the same time, preference-giving countries may wish to consider possible improvements in their autonomous schemes to bring them more into line with the basic principles that govern the GSP, namely generalization, non-discrimination, and non-reciprocity. The remainder of this chapter discusses the changes that could be considered.

A. Non-tariff measures and effective access to GSP benefits

74. As already noted, the increasing resort to non-tariff measures by several preference-giving countries has reduced considerably the effectiveness of their GSP schemes as trade-creating instruments. Undoubtedly, this issue, as it relates to the effective utilization of the GSP, cannot be resolved

separately from the question of non-tariff measures being discussed in the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations. However, preference-giving countries may wish to consider ways of dealing with the non-tariff measures which impede access to markets for products which nominally enjoy GSP status. One approach may be to exempt products enjoying GSP status from non-tariff measures affecting the exports of beneficiaries.

B. The relationship between product coverage, exclusions and safeguards

75. Expansion of the product coverage of the GSP schemes is perhaps the most important means for improving the system during the 1990s. Under the current system, there is a relationship between product coverage and country-product exclusions. Preference-giving countries use varied criteria for differentiating product coverage among beneficiaries. Some of these criteria relate to denying product coverage to certain beneficiaries deemed competitive by the individual preference-giving countries. The criteria for these determinations differ among the schemes, are often arbitrary and sometimes not related to trade performance. Some schemes employ differential product coverage lists for different sets of beneficiaries (sometimes also invoking differential depths of tariff cuts), thereby limiting the product coverage for beneficiaries deemed competitive in certain product lines. The criteria for determining the competitiveness of beneficiaries are often not made public. In addition, as part of the "graduation" policies of some preference-giving countries, some developing countries have been faced with permanent or temporary exclusions from all GSP benefits. As already discussed above, the criteria for excluding countries from the GSP schemes have varied widely among preference-giving countries. In some cases, the withdrawal of beneficiary status has violated the principle of non-reciprocity or has invoked criteria alien to the GSP.

76. A clear distinction needs to be made between country-product exclusions and safeguard provisions. While the latter are related to protecting the domestic industries of preference-giving countries from import surges directly attributable to the GSP, the former relate to subjective determinations of preference-giving countries as to which beneficiaries do not need preferences in specific products covered by GSP.

77. While some schemes have sought to lay down objective quantitative criteria for country-product exclusions, most of the exclusions under various schemes are non-transparent and subjective. The main objectives of the exclusions are to withdraw preferences from beneficiaries which have become competitive and thus to distribute the gains of preferences among other less competitive beneficiaries. A number of studies have shown that, in actual practice, this latter objective has not been achieved by the exclusions. On the one hand, the beneficiaries that are excluded generally lose their exports, while on the other hand, very little, if any, gains go to poorer beneficiaries. 41/

78. In any case, subjective and non-transparent product-country exclusions result in uncertainty and instability, making it difficult for firms in the beneficiary countries to plan ahead for investment, production and export. It is, therefore, necessary that the issue of such exclusions be addressed seriously.

79. The best way, of course, is to eliminate product-country exclusion and to depend entirely on safeguard mechanisms to exclude products from preferences. However, if product-country exclusions are to continue, these should be based on objective, transparent and multilaterally agreed norms which would require the proven achievement of sustained competitiveness in a particular product prior to the exclusion of a beneficiary.

80. Action to expand product coverage could be facilitated if the safeguard clauses contained in the schemes were improved. In addition, resort to safeguards rather than to more permanent and arbitrary product-country limitations would enhance the transparency and value of the system for beneficiaries. It is universally accepted that importing countries require means to safeguard domestic industry when any product is imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten to cause serious injury to domestic producers. In the context of the GSP, the agreed conclusions of the Special Committee on Preferences adopted by the Trade and Development Board at its fourth special session also covered safeguard mechanisms. 42/ The agreed conclusions indicated that such measures would "remain exceptional" and that the "preference-giving countries would offer opportunities for appropriate consultations to beneficiary countries, in particular to those having a substantial trade interest in the product concerned." 43/

81. General safeguards under the GSP differ significantly from scheme to scheme. The criteria for determing injury are not uniform and, with few exceptions, are also not transparent. Nor are there a priori mechanisms for consultations. While provision has been made for plurilateral and bilateral consultations in the context of the annual sessions of the Special Committee on Preferences, 44/ these consultations have not yet addressed specific safeguard actions per se. The effectiveness and stability of the GSP could be greatly enhanced if the provisions relating to safeguards in the Agreed Conclusions 45/ are strictly adhered to by preference-giving countries and, particularly if multilaterally agreed, objective and transparent criteria for injury determination could be adopted.

C. Improving the depth of tariff cut, rules of origin and provisions for least developed countries

82. The preferential tariff margin is the essence of the GSP. In response to this margin, importers and manufacturers in preference-giving countries are expected to shift their sources of supply in favour of developing countries. In the face of the impending erosion of GSP margins resulting from tariff liberalization in the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, preference-giving countries may wish to consider granting across-the-board duty-free treatment to products originating from developing countries or, wherever this is not possible, enlarging the margin of preference to compensate for the recent and prospective reductions in MFN rates.

83. If GSP utilization is to improve, it is widely recognized that the diverse and complicated GSP rules of origin are in dire need of harmonization and simplification. The universal application of the Harmonized commodity description and coding system (Harmonized System) by all preference-giving countries now provides an opportunity to adopt a uniform approach for determining substantial transformation by using the process criteria.

If this should prove impossible, a great step forward could be taken if the 14 preference-giving countries using the percentage criteria could adopt a uniform maximum percentage of foreign inputs allowable for a beneficiary to be eligible for GSP status. Likewise, uniform and simplified rules on documentary evidence and the inclusion of full and global cumulation, complemented by measures to include contents originating in the preference-giving country in the cumulation, could greatly improve utilization of the system.

84. In the case of treatment of the LDCs, the adoption of improvements in the schemes based on the highest common denominator should be considered. While LDCs receive better access conditions under most schemes, there are still considerable differences in such treatment. Given the special needs and problems of these countries and their limited export supply capabilities, consideration might be given to awarding them better and uniform treatment under the rules of origin and across-the-board duty-free treatment for all dutiable products in the HS without any quantitative or other limitations.

Notes

1/ The following documents are relevant to the current session of the Special Committee: Review of the Generalized System of Preferences in pursuance of paragraph 105 (5) of the Final Act of UNCTAD VII, TD/B/C.5/121; The Generalized System of Preferences: A review of changes in the schemes since their inception, UNCTAD/ITP/14; and, Twelfth general report on the implementation of the Generalized System of Preferences, TD/B/C.5/122 and TD/B/C.5/122/Add.1.

2/ See annex table 4 for comprehensive information on beneficiary status under the individual GSP schemes.

3/ This document contains a summary of the changes and improvements related to the EEC GSP scheme for 1990. For details see TD/B/GSP/EEC/17.

4/ Products identified by the following Austrian tariff lines: 200190 B1, 200190 B2, 200190 F1 ex c, 200190 F2 ex f, 200820 A2 b, 200820 B2, 200891, 200892 A1, 200892 B2, 200899 A1 a2, 200940 B1 b, 200980 B2 a2, 200990 B 3a and 200990 Bb 1.

5/ Seeds of Caraway (H.S. 090940), Poppy seeds (H.S. 120791).

6/ Tyres of a kind used on scooters (HS ex 40.11), inner tubes of a kind used on motorcycles (HS ex 40.13).

7/ Felt made by stick-bonding (HS ex 56.02).

8/ Leaves of "Sarutoriibara" (srvilex China) (HS 14.04.90 -4 ex), Palm hearts (HS 200891).

9/ Products identified by the following Norwegian tariff lines: HS ex 10.06, 15.08, ex 15.11, 15.13, ex 15.15, ex 15.16, ex 15.19 and ex 24.02.

10/ Products identified by the following Polish tariff lines: HS 08.07.20, 08.10.90, 10.06.10, 20, 30 and 40, 12.11.90, 15.08.10 and 90, 15.11.10 and 90, 15.13.11, 19, 21 and 29, 15.15.60 and 90, 15.18.00, 15.19.11, 12, 19, 20 and 30, 15.21.1, 20.06.00, 20.08.11, 91 and 92.

11/ Products identified by the following Polish tariff lines: HS ex 32.03.00, ex 44.03, ex 44.09, ex 44.10, ex 44.12, 44.14, ex 44.18, ex 44.21, 46.01.20 and 46.01.91.

12/ Products identified by the following Swiss tariff lines: HS 06.02.1000 and 9991, 06.03.1019, 9010 and 9090, 08.02.9000, 08.05.3000, 09.01.1100, 11.06.2000, 12.02.1000, 12.03.0000, 12.07.1000, 3000 and 9200, 12.08.9000, 15.19.1100, 17.01.1100, 1200 and 9900, 20.08.1190 and 9993 and 21.01.2090.

13/ Products identified by the following tariff lines: HS 29.07.1100, 1915 and 1925, 29.18.1960, 38.17.1000, 70.19.1040, 96.07.2000, 96.07.2040 and 96.07.2080.

14/ Steel pipe fittings TSUS 73.07.9330.

15/ 17.01.11 cane sugar; 17.01.12 beet sugar; 17.01.91 other, containing added flavouring or colouring matter; 24.02.20 cigarettes containing tobacco; and, 24.02.90 other.

16/ Excluding product group No. 47, (wood of Kiri, roughly squared or half-squared, HS ex 44.03, ex 44.07 and ex 44.09) which was deleted.

17/ Goods imported under New Zealand concessions under references 25 and 26.

18/ Goods imported under New Zealand concessions under reference 99.

19/ Hexamethylenetetramine TSUS 29.33.9047.

20/ Toys: TSUS 95.03.9070.

21/ Aromatic drugs (TSUS 29.24.2959) and medicaments, etc. (TSUS 30.04.9060).

22/ Medicaments, etc. (TSUS 30.04.9060).

23/ Imports of these two products in 1988 amounted to $8.7 million, or 0.35 per cent of the total amount of trade eligible for redesignation ($2.5 billion). In the 1988 redesignation exercise, GSP eligibility was restored for imports valued at $114 million in 1987 and non-redesignation for preferential benefits accounted for $1.5 billion of beneficiary country trade.

24/ The general competitive need limitation, indexed to the United States GNP, was $82.5 million of imports in 1988. The lower competitive need limit was $32.2 million. For details on the application of these limits, see TD/B/C.5/96, paras. 34-38.

25/ The applicable de minimis limit was $US 9,691,811 of imports in 1988.

26/ See UNCTAD TD/B/GSP/AUSTRIA/21.

27/ See UNCTAD TD/B/GSP/CZECH/5.

28/ Previously, preferences were granted to "developing countries" without any specification.

29/ See UNCTAD TD/B/GSP/FINLAND/12.

30/ Tableware ... of porcelain or china (HS 69.11) and ceramic tableware (HS 69.12).

31/ Roasted coffee (HS ex 09.01).

32/ Products identified by the following Swiss tariff lines: 07.14.2000, 08.03.0000, 08.05.4000 and 9000, 12.07.2000 and 9100, 20.09.3011 and 3019.

33/ For details of the evolution of each element under the various GSP schemes, see "Review of the generalized system of preferences in pursuance of paragraph 105 (5) of the Final Act of UNCTAD VII" (TD/B/C.5/121).

34/ TD/B/C.5/121, Table 1.

35/ The dollar value limit was set initially at $25 million in the 1974 Trade Act and amounted to $82.5 million in 1988.

36/ See TD/B/C.5/120, TD/B/C.5/121 and UNCTAD/ITP/14 submitted to the Special Committee on Preferences at its sixteenth session for details on the continuing debate on the GSP rules of origin.

37/ These calculations show a smaller percentage of excluded products in total MFN dutiable imports than the estimate implicit in annex table 1 for all OECD preference-giving countries (about 50 per cent). The basic reason is that all imports by the United States from Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea, Singapore and Taiwan Province of China, which were removed from the United States scheme on 1 January 1989, were excluded from the calculations of annex tables 2 and 3.

38/ Craig R. MacPhee, "A synthesis of the GSP study programme", UNCTAD/ITP/19, Geneva, 5 December 1989, p. 22.

39/ Guy Karsenty and Sam Laird, "The Generalized System of Preferences - A quantitative assessment of the direct trade effects and of policy options", UNCTAD Discussion Paper No. 18, Geneva, n.d.

40/ Craig R. MacPhee, op. cit., p. 23.

41/ See Craig R. MacPhee, "Effects of competitive need exclusions and redesignations under the United States scheme of generalized preferences", UNCTAD/ST/MD/29/Rev.1, Geneva, 12 January 1986; Craig R. MacPhee, "The trade effects of a priori limitations under the European Economic Community scheme of generalized preferences", UNCTAD/ST/MD/30, 22 June 1988; and United States International Trade Commission, An Evaluation of United States Imports under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) (USITC Publication 1379, Washington, D.C., May 1983).

42/ Decision 75 (S-IV).

43/ Ibid., Section III.

44/ Resolution 6 (IX).

45/ Op. cit., Decision 75 (S-IV), Section III, Agreed Conclusions, para. 2.

ANNEX

Table 1

Imports of preference-giving countries from beneficiaries of their schemes, 1976-1988

(millions of US dollars)

Preference-giving country & year (CCCN 1-99)	Total imports	MFN dutiable imports	GSP imports covered	GSP imports preferential	Percentage share (3)/(2)	(4)/(3)	(4)/(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
AUSTRALIA							
FY 1976	2249.9	885.4	412.8	412.8	46.6	100.0	46.6
FY 1977	2876.3	883.6	376.2	372.7	42.6	99.1	42.2
FY 1978	3248.3	1125.5	516.3	493.0	45.9	95.5	43.8
FY 1979	4808.3	2231.0	1237.5	1211.5	59.5	97.9	54.3
FY 1980	5952.9	2746.2	1777.7	1736.0	64.7	97.7	63.2
FY 1981	6211.1	2929.9	1979.8	1979.8	67.6	100.0	67.6
FY 1982	5602.0	2661.5	1794.9	1794.9	67.4	100.0	67.4
FY 1983	4880.7	2797.4	1689.2	1689.2	60.4	100.0	60.4
FY 1984	4579.4	2826.3	1654.1	1654.1	58.5	100.0	58.5
AUSTRIA							
1976	1327.5	1123.1	998.3	126.1	88.9	12.6	11.2
1977	1472.7	1245.3	1103.4	172.1	88.6	15.6	13.8
1978	1646.4	1327.4	1139.9	207.8	85.9	18.2	15.7
1979	2318.3	1902.4	1683.7	282.9	88.5	16.8	14.9
1980	3143.5	2675.0	2459.4	345.9	91.9	14.1	12.9
1981	2745.0	2371.1	2025.6	251.0	85.4	12.4	10.6
1982	2279.1	1949.5	1814.8	251.4	93.1	13.9	12.9
1983	1876.0	1566.3	1435.8	286.5	91.7	19.9	18.3
1984	2177.6	1853.8	1732.2	320.1	93.4	18.5	17.3
1985	2262.7	1947.4	1825.1	298.2	93.7	16.3	15.3
1986	2159.8	1799.3	1644.3	396.9	91.4	24.1	22.1
1987	2660.0	2251.7	2030.9	633.0	90.2	31.2	28.1
1988	3326.6	2718.8	2291.3	687.3	84.3	30.0	25.3
CANADA							
1976	4256.8	1058.1	561.3	411.4	53.0	73.3	38.9
1977	4115.9	992.8	571.5	428.9	57.5	75.1	43.2
1978	4006.9	1125.1	684.3	527.4	60.8	77.1	46.9
1979	4587.0	1532.4	1000.0	727.4	65.3	72.7	47.5
1980	5360.2	1594.1	952.8	753.7	59.8	79.1	46.2
1981	6877.9	2163.3	1176.0	857.9	54.4	73.0	39.7
1982	5658.6	1950.9	1109.4	775.0	56.8	69.8	39.7
1983	6099.5	2319.4	1312.1	955.7	56.6	72.8	41.2
1984	6959.6	2913.6	1727.5	1293.9	59.3	74.9	44.4
1985	6757.2	3057.9	1949.3	1554.7	63.7	79.7	50.8
1986	6841.2	3585.4	2186.8	1656.9	61.0	75.8	46.2
1987	7816.9	4173.2	2244.1	1538.6	53.8	68.6	36.9

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
EEC							
1976	79939.7	17950.0	10903.0	3915.9	60.7	35.9	21.8
1977	71233.8	19762.3	12246.0	4390.1	62.0	35.9	22.2
1978	68350.1	19424.3	13741.0	4540.6	70.7	33.0	23.4
1979	90861.1	26945.3	19168.6	6990.9	71.1	36.5	25.9
1980	121225.9	37890.4	26709.3	9341.1	70.5	35.0	24.7
1981	111282.3	30786.8	23971.1	9002.0	77.9	37.6	29.2
1982	94675.5	30312.6	23031.5	8684.0	76.0	37.7	28.6
1983	80505.0	30461.5	22298.6	8393.9	73.2	37.6	27.6
1984	72491.0	29680.0	22459.0	9798.0	75.7	43.6	33.0
1985	71156.0	31080.0	23366.0	11196.0	75.2	47.9	36.0
1986	73892.0	40428.0	27969.0	11118.0	69.2	39.8	27.5
1987	88554.0	50953.0	40076.0	17977.0	78.7	44.9	35.3
1988	..	..	60894.2	19160.9	..	31.5	..
FINLAND							
1976	722.0	127.8	29.1	20.8	22.8	71.5	16.3
1977	852.2	121.0	45.1	25.3	37.3	56.1	20.9
1978	821.5	124.7	60.7	44.2	48.7	72.8	35.4
1979	1338.4	248.5	90.2	68.6	36.3	76.0	27.6
1980	1679.3	193.3	96.0	70.0	49.7	72.8	36.2
1981	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1982	983.3	325.0	132.5	108.4	40.8	81.8	33.4
1983	1676.8	584.9	282.0	239.7	48.2	85.0	41.0
1984	1725.9	650.2	330.4	285.1	50.8	86.3	43.8
1985	2291.3	733.1	358.7	276.3	48.9	77.0	37.7
1986	2169.5	1002.7	453.6	333.4	45.2	73.5	33.3
1987	2808.9	1308.4	692.7	491.5	52.9	71.0	37.6
1988	3134.7	1433.7	811.6	500.0	56.6	61.6	34.9
JAPAN							
FY 1976	13457.9	6369.3	3369.3	1789.5	52.9	53.1	28.1
FY 1977	14507.5	7020.8	3930.1	2303.2	56.0	58.6	32.8
FY 1978	18681.9	9672.7	5834.3	3147.4	60.3	53.9	32.5
FY 1979	25423.4	11759.3	7577.3	4317.2	64.4	57.0	36.7
FY 1980	29113.2	12622.6	8486.8	4984.6	67.3	58.7	39.5
FY 1981	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
FY 1982	27528.2	13331.2	8575.3	5263.3	64.3	61.4	39.5
FY 1983	29207.1	13876.9	8887.7	5323.2	64.0	59.9	38.4
FY 1984	32553.0	15268.0	10042.0	6037.0	65.8	60.1	39.5
FY 1985	33450.2	15796.8	9812.6	5858.5	62.1	59.7	37.1
FY 1986	37248.7	19822.7	11992.9	6830.6	60.5	57.0	34.5
FY 1987	50304.0	28462.9	18728.0	9669.8	65.8	51.6	34.0
FY 1988	66424.0	38382.0	26506.o	14147.0	69.0	53.4	36.9

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
NEW ZEALAND							
FY 1976	571.8	150.0	140.0	140.0	93.3	100.0	93.3
FY 1977	556.5	159.1	147.6	147.6	92.8	100.0	92.8
FY 1978	664.1	173.2	158.7	158.7	91.6	100.0	91.6
FY 1979	1203.9	236.7	217.8	217.8	92.0	100.0	92.0
FY 1980	1479.0	243.9	221.2	221.2	90.7	100.0	90.7
FY 1981	1264.3	275.0	246.9	246.9	89.9	100.0	89.8
FY 1982	1071.6	268.6	238.4	238.4	88.8	100.0	88.8
FY 1983	1001.6	296.8	260.2	260.2	87.7	100.0	87.7
FY 1984	1003.1	345.9	300.1	300.1	86.8	100.0	86.8
NORWAY							
1976	1171.8	95.0	44.3	22.4	46.6	50.5	23.6
1977	1284.2	178.6	69.2	35.5	38.7	51.3	19.9
1978	1186.7	141.4	71.1	33.5	50.3	47.2	23.7
1979	1256.9	179.3	91.6	44.3	51.1	48.4	24.7
1980	1550.1	225.2	134.7	63.2	59.8	46.9	28.1
1981	1185.9	296.2	128.3	66.9	43.3	52.1	22.6
1982	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1983	944.4	272.6	131.0	63.5	48.1	48.5	23.3
1984	934.3	293.1	131.9	67.6	45.0	51.3	23.1
1985	1274.7	417.7	241.5	104.6	57.8	43.3	25.0
1986	1344.7	603.8	396.1	147.8	65.6	37.3	24.5
1987	1972.9	812.6	522.7	229.2	64.3	43.8	28.2
SWEDEN							
1976	2732.8	941.5	189.1	144.8	20.1	76.6	15.4
1977	2826.6	563.0	219.5	166.6	39.0	75.9	29.6
1978	2732.8	567.9	253.4	187.2	44.6	73.9	33.0
1979	3858.8	755.9	365.3	265.7	48.3	72.7	35.2
1980	4734.2	964.3	453.4	321.5	47.0	70.8	33.3
1981	3881.3	821.5	395.5	272.5	48.1	68.9	33.2
1982	2913.0	699.8	313.9	219.5	44.9	69.9	31.4
1983	2321.5	709.2	338.4	225.0	47.7	66.5	31.7
1984	1954.3	771.7	389.5	266.4	50.5	68.4	34.5
1985	2618.3	973.3	488.2	323.5	50.2	66.3	33.2
1986	2558.3	1095.3	533.8	364.2	48.7	68.2	33.3
1987	3293.6	1739.4	851.7	578.3	49.0	67.9	33.2

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
SWITZERLAND							
1976	1541.0	1418.6	635.2	257.1	44.8	40.5	18.1
1977	2078.1	1961.1	874.3	379.1	44.6	43.4	19.3
1978	2328.3	2191.0	1111.2	479.6	50.7	43.2	21.9
1979	2829.2	2699.6	1288.4	560.3	47.7	43.5	20.8
1980	3997.1	3828.6	1881.5	680.7	49.1	36.2	17.8
1981	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1982	2851.6	2751.6	1180.4	449.5	42.9	38.1	16.3
1983	2823.8	2731.3	1130.3	419.8	41.4	37.1	15.4
1984	2947.0	2855.3	1276.9	453.2	44.7	35.5	15.9
1985	2793.1	2390.1	1252.5	566.9	52.4	45.3	23.7
1986	2897.2	2762.8	1447.7	655.3	52.4	45.3	23.7
1987	4617.5	4463.0	2629.9	1010.0	60.3	37.5	22.6
1988	4980.7	4786.4	3219.9	1154.0	58.9	38.4	24.1
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA							
1976	28497.6	21879.8	6530.0	3160.3	29.8	48.4	14.4
1977	34597.9	25654.2	7677.6	3878.0	29.9	50.5	15.1
1978	41417.0	31381.4	9741.1	5204.2	31.0	53.4	16.6
1979	94531.7	28163.8	11752.2	6280.0	30.7	53.4	16.5
1980	70480.7	53823.3	14310.9	7308.0	26.6	51.1	13.6
1981	60751.5	53823.3 a/	16870.4	8395.5	31.3	49.8	15.6
1982	78305.2	65925.3	17430.8	8422.0	26.4	48.3	12.8
1983	89600.0	65225.3 b/	22600.0	10800.0	34.3	47.8	16.4
1984	105408.5	89720.0	29776.9	12997.0	33.2	43.6	14.5
1985	101566.3	91917.0	29282.0	13300.0	31.9	45.4	14.5
1986	112275.0	94166.6	35574.8	13844.9	37.8	38.9	14.7
1987	133510.2	105892.3	44646.6	16299.5	42.2	36.5	15.4

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TOTAL COUNTRIES							
1976	136468.8	51998.6	23812.4	10401.1	45.8	43.7	20.0
1977	136281.7	58541.8	27260.5	12299.1	46.6	45.1	21.0
1978	145084.0	67254.6	33312.0	15023.6	49.5	45.1	22.3
1979	233017.0	86654.2	44472.6	20966.6	51.3	47.1	24.2
1980	248716.1	116806.9	57483.7	25807.9	49.2	44.9	22.1
1981 c/	194199.3	93467.1	46793.6	21072.5	50.1	45.0	22.5
1982 d/	221868.1	120176.0	55621.9	26206.9	46.3	47.1	21.8
1983	220936.4	121541.6	60365.3	28656.7	49.7	47.5	23.6
1984	232733.7	147177.9	69820.5	33472.5	47.4	47.9	22.7
1985 e/	224169.8	148313.3	68575.9	33478.7	46.2	48.8	22.6
1986 e/	241386.4	165266.6	82199.0	35348.0	49.7	43.0	21.4
1987 e/	295538.0	200056.5	112422.6	48426.9	56.2	43.1	24.2

Source: UNCTAD secretariat calculations, based on notifications received from preference-giving countries.

a/ 1980 imports.

b/ 1982 imports.

c/ Excluding Finland, Japan and Switzerland.

d/ Excluding Norway.

e/ Excluding Australia and New Zealand.

Table 2

Imports into selected DMECS of products excluded from their respective GSP schemes in 1986 a/
(Value in millions of US dollars)

Preference-giving countries		World total	Beneficiary countries b/				Major beneficiaries affected			
			Total	Dutiable	Excluded	% share 5/4	Imports of excluded products		% share 7/5	Number of products excluded
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)		(8)	(9)
Austria	CCCN 1-24	1 751.3	520.4	457.6	83.2	18.2	Brazil	16.0	15	29
							Hong Kong	13.4	12	8
	CCCN 25-99	21 898.3	1 509.8	596.2	24.4	4.1	Yugoslavia	9.8	9	91
							Israel	9.0	41	38
	Total	23 649.6	2 030.2	1 053.8	107.6	10.2	Bulgaria	7.5	58	33
							Romania	7.5	21	41
							Thailand	3.9	20	18
							Spa.Afr.Ter.	3.5	100	8
							Morocco	3.4	69	10
							Colombia	3.3	6	5
							Sub-total	77.3	71.8	
Canada	CCCN 1-24	8 150.4	1 153.0	374.8	237.9	63.5	Mexico	694.9	89	123
							Venezuela	303.0	98	18
	CCCN 25-99	72 941.9	5 610.4	4 781.7	2 519.0	52.7	Rep. of Korea	284.0	24	152
							Nigeria	264.2	100	1
	Total	81 092.3	6 763.4	5 156.5	2 756.9	53.5	Brazil	189.7	52	107
							Hong Kong	187.0	28	146
							Iran	132.9	99	3
							China	104.6	34	108
							Cuba	46.0	95	11
							Thailand	44.3	54	55
							Sub-total	2 250.6	81.6	
EEC	CCCN 1-24	39 163.6	11 844.1	9 151.7	1 757.4	19.2	Thailand	754.0	44	68
							China	298.4	11	121
	CCCN 25-99	250 006.8	50 590.9	20 930.0	582.6	2.8	Brazil	245.3	8	94
							Argentina	195.4	32	115
	Total	289 170.4	62 435.0	30 081.7	2 340.0	7.8	Chile	187.7	44	85
							Indonesia	114.9	13	31
							Romania	68.8	6	74
							Uruguay	67.4	40	42
							India	45.1	3	60
							Venezuela	38.0	34	24
							Sub-total	2 015.0	86.1	

(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)		(9)
Finland	CCCN 1-24	848.4	305.6	261.6	223.6	85.5	Brazil	65.9	86	78
							Colombia	50.8	98	11
	CCCN 25-99	12 258.4	665.9	179.8	102.1	56.8	Rep. of Korea	24.9	57	188
							Costa Rica	21.0	80	8
	Total	13 106.8	971.5	441.4	325.7	73.8	Israel	20.8	81	90
							China	17.8	65	175
							Guatemala	12.1	100	6
							Argentina	8.7	78	35
							Kenya	8.2	97	13
							Morocco	7.0	90	21
							Sub-total	237.2	72.8	
Japan	CCCN 1-24	21 942.9	9 988.2	7 112.9	5 417.7	76.2	Rep. of Korea	1 634.4	38	399
							Taiwan, (Province of China)	1 560.5	41	401
	CCCN 25-99	105 939.2	52 764.2	12 816.7	3 609.3	28.2				
							China	1 410.9	49	367
	Total	127 882.1	62 752.4	19 929.6	9 027.0	45.3	Thailand	705.7	77	156
							India	531.3	86	105
							Indonesia	451.1	60	91
							Brazil	390.6	47	124
							Hong Kong	310.4	36	252
							Israel	269.4	87	63
							Philippines	266.9	33	117
							Sub-total	7 531.2	83.4	
New Zealand	CCCN 1-24	409.7	146.5	52.9	31.8	60.1	Taiwan, (Province of China)	9.8	13	106
	CCCN 25-99	5 574.0	858.0	289.2	39.2	13.6	India	8.3	42	37
							Brazil	7.5	34	34
	Total	5 983.7	1 004.5	342.1	71.0	20.8	Singapore	6.2	23	49
							Rep. of Korea	5.5	16	61
							Hong Kong	4.8	6	73
							Sri Lanka	4.8	99	6
							Thailand	3.4	38	29
							Jamaica	3.1	100	3
							Indonesia	2.8	60	9
							Sub-total	56.2	79.2	
Norway	CCCN 1-24	1 347.4	375.8	76.2	3.0	3.9	Hong Kong	68.8	59	175
							Rep. of Korea	22.3	13	101
	CCCN 25-99	18 920.4	958.6	526.4	177.4	33.7	China	14.2	28	98
							India	10.2	59	86
	Total	20 267.8	1 [illegible]4.4	602.6	180.4	29.9	Malaysia	9.1	53	51
							Brazil	6.4	45	60
							Singapore	6.1	25	50
							Thailand	6.0	47	79
							Yugoslavia	5.6	21	77
							Pakistan	4.2	37	59
							Sub-total	152.9	84.8	

(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)		(9)
Sweden	CCCN 1-24	2 636.1	810.8	68.9	29.7	43.1	Hong Kong	155.6	56	252
							Rep. of Korea	95.1	50	178
	CCCN 25-99	29 853.3	1 779.3	1 042.2	509.9	48.9	China	60.0	60	163
							India	28.0	66	115
	Total	32 489.4	2 590.1	1 111.1	539.6	48.6	Yugoslavia	21.9	26	145
							Thailand	17.9	51	128
							Turkey	16.7	80	100
							Brazil	14.0	22	68
							Malaysia	13.2	34	76
							Pakistan	12.3	68	77
							Sub-total	434.7	80.6	
Switzerland	CCCN 1-24	3 453.3	771.5	664.1	519.1	78.2	Brazil	74.4	48	41
							Colombia	61.6	80	11
	CCCN 25-99	37 411.4	2 111.3	1 620.3	4.6	.	Israel	35.3	27	59
							Costa Rica	34.8	23	9
	Total	40 864.7	2 882.8	2 284.3	523.7	22.9	Turkey	33.6	28	56
							Argentina	31.3	70	32
							Guatemala	28.3	93	5
							Honduras	23.7	98	5
							Panama	18.3	21	5
							Kenya	18.2	81	14
							Sub-total	359.5	68.6	
United States	CCCN 1-24	25 849.4	12 921.9	4 420.0	2 425.1	54.9	Mexico	4 097.6	39	724
							Brazil	2 340.3	55	569
	CCCN 25-99	341 616.6	47 536.5	24 555.5	12 975.0	52.8	Malaysia	1 607.5	82	249
							Philippines	1 224.7	76	415
	Total	367 466.0	60 458.4	28 975.5	15 401.1	53.2	Thailand	899.4	70	421
							Indonesia	609.0	94	245
							India	590.6	70	493
							Turkey	454.7	90	287
							Dominican Rep.	358.9	53	256
							Yugoslavia	315.4	52	258
							Sub-total	12 498.1	81.2	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
DMEC preference-giving countries (excluding Australia) c/								
CCCN 1-24	105 552.5	38 837.8	22 640.6	10 728.6	47.4	Mexico	4 926.2	40.6
						Brazil	3 350.0	36.7
						Thailand	2 441.4	58.0
CCCN 25-99	896 420.3	164 384.9	67 338.0	20 543.5	30.5	Rep. of Korea	2 078.1	20.7
						China	1 914.3	30.2
						Malaysia	1 789.7	52.6
						Taiwan, (Province of China)	1 571.3	39.9
						Philippines	1 534.1	49.7
						India	1 243.4	38.2
						Indonesia	1 220.4	50.4
						Hong Kong	747.2	11.0
						Argentina	587.9	40.2
						Turkey	587.8	75.6
						Israel	548.1	33.4
						Pakistan	507.1	39.5
						Venezuela	416.9	44.8
						Yugoslavia	377.4	38.0
						Dominican Rep.	363.2	50.1
						Colombia	328.4	14.8
						Sri Lanka	325.8	60.0
						Costa Rica	311.2	42.6
						Sub-total	27 169.9	88.0
TOTAL	1 001 972.8	203 222.7	89 978.6	31 272.1	34.8			

Source: UNCTAD/GATT computer tapes and UNCTAD calculations.

a/ 1985 for Finland and New Zealand.

b/ Only actual beneficiaries as from 1 January 1989 under each scheme have been taken into account (e.g. under the scheme of the United States, the Republic of Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan (Province of China) and Singapore were not taken into account).

c/ Australia has not been taken into account since its scheme covers all dutiable products.

Table 3

IMPORTS INTO DEVELOPED MARKET-ECONOMY COUNTRIES [a] OF PRODUCTS EXCLUDED FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE SCHEMES, FROM INDIVIDUAL BENEFICIARY, 1986 [b]

(Thousands of dollars)

Imports from [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value (1)	Total dutiable imports Value (2)	Share (1)/(2) (per cent) (3)	Share of manuf.& semi-manuf. in exports (per cent) (4)	Number of Manuf. & semi-manuf. products exported (5)
I. ALL PRODUCTS					
WORLD	226021356	657354159	34.4		
Beneficiaries	31282051	89978625	34.8		
Beneficiaries (other than least developed countries)	30649973	88644291	34.6 34.6		
MEXICO	4926180	12122488	40.6	34.7	300
BRAZIL	3349987	9130646	36.7	42.0	448
THAILAND	2441426	4209213	58.0	43.5	310
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF	2078094	10026650	20.7	85.1	668
CHINA	1914279	6330719	30.2	48.2	638
MALAYSIA	1789685	3399456	52.6	38.3	218
TAIWAN, Province of China	1571319	3933331	39.9	90.2	950
PHILIPPINES	1534085	3085451	49.7	58.6	266
INDIA	1243395	3256374	38.2	37.8	429
INDONESIA	1220419	2423422	50.4	8.4	137
HONG KONG	747248	6807058	11.0	93.6	818
ARGENTINA	587935	1461031	40.2	21.3	119
TURKEY	587812	777686	75.6	47.8	198
ISRAEL	548051	1641581	33.4	50.8	380
PAKISTAN	507067	1284652	39.5	65.6	133
VENEZUELA	416856	929627	44.8	6.0	49
YUGOSLAVIA	377369	992462	38.0	73.9	512
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	363157	725267	50.1	32.6	80
COLOMBIA	328355	2211588	14.8	9.2	72
SRI LANKA	325816	542898	60.0	47.8	88
COSTA RICA	311150	730501	42.6	18.6	37
CHILE	299161	657825	45.5	19.3	198
NIGERIA	268607	268673	100.0	0.8	25
MACAU	255526	878313	29.1	96.6	113
SINGAPORE	218024	1857976	11.7	66.7	383
CUBA	184979	363193	50.9	12.7	13
URUGUAY	156474	316730	49.4	25.9	43
PERU	155517	649258	24.0	22.8	96
JAMAICA	144044	185023	77.9	26.2	38
IRAN (Islamic Rep.of)	141206	492403	28.7	2.5	30
PANAMA	128186	433510	29.6	19.9	36
HONDURAS	109432	347169	31.5	12.1	19
ROMANIA	104002	1318371	7.9	40.8	172
MAURITIUS	95500	127071	75.2	46.5	38
BARBADOS	94991	117345	81.0	89.1	19
GUATEMALA	92801	344440	26.9	4.9	43
MOROCCO	85583	218305	39.2	41.9	106
VIET NAM	63159	85689	73.7	N.A	N.A
EL SALVADOR	59412	253937	23.4	22.9	27
ZIMBABWE	56329	113084	49.8	27.9	28
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	56327	61123	92.2	N.A	N.A
ECUADOR	48216	297936	16.2	1.6	39
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	46360	71809	64.6	6.6	18
KENYA	45227	73464	61.6	12.1	38
EGYPT	42079	68581	61.4	8.9	58
ZAIRE	31287	91015	34.4	7.3	14
U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS	30645	32484	94.3	8.9	3
BULGARIA	30575	60874	50.2	43.6	99
ANGOLA	29961	29968	100.0	0.2	8
SURINAME	29205	31175	93.7	31.3	8
MALTA	27730	53880	51.5	82.9	92
BELIZE	25891	41226	62.8	33.4	9
MADAGASCAR	25542	32321	79.0	11.4	11
NICARAGUA	25329	149664	16.9	1.2	10

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)	Share of manuf.& semi-manuf. in exports (per cent)	Number of Manuf. & semi-manuf. products exported
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I. ALL PRODUCTS (continued)					
FIJI	19738	29106	67.8	30.2	25
COMMONWEALTH AFRICA n.e.s.	19597	20798	94.2	N.A	N.A
BERMUDA	17474	19001	92.0	18.6	20
CYPRUS	17004	30889	55.0	34.1	68
TUNISIA	14016	28756	48.7	54.4	76
SENEGAL	12374	26177	47.3	43.9	21
SWAZILAND	11388	26828	42.4	19.2	10
NETHERLANDS ANTILLES	10856	17497	62.0	1.1	39
ALGERIA	10628	11461	92.7	0.6	30
SAINT LUCIA	9828	10651	92.3	10.9	12
HUNGARY	9519	58273	16.3	48.2	358
GUYANA	8439	19614	43.0	8.9	7
CAMEROON, Republic of	8259	16623	49.7	5.5	21
BAHRAIN	7200	91578	7.9	21.4	25
SAUDI ARABIA	6718	676896	1.0	2.3	71
PARAGUAY	6659	74593	8.9	11.2	13
COTE D'IVOIRE	6654	69001	9.6	11.3	35
GHANA	6567	9207	71.3	9.8	10
BOLIVIA	6431	31998	20.1	7.9	19
LEBANON	5877	73448	8.0	39.5	45
ANTIGUA BARBUDA	5414	9915	54.6	95.5	13
BAHAMAS	5204	237655	2.2	16.5	26
JORDAN	4241	55838	7.6	15.9	26
GABON	4123	4123	100.0	1.9	20
SPANISH AFRICAN territories	3539	3551	99.7	N.A	N.A
ZAMBIA	2926	247310	1.2	51.2	8
SOLOMON ISLANDS	2777	3383	82.1	26.9	4
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	2742	73802	3.7	1.9	66
TOKELAU	2723	3067	88.8	100.0	2
KUWAIT	2686	17894	15.0	0.5	32
ST.VINCENT GRENADA	2620	8261	31.7	9.2	13
ST.HELENA	2463	3099	79.5	51.0	13
SEYCHELLES	2014	4001	50.3	4.3	13
FRENCH POLYNESIA	2004	4838	41.4	52.7	13
SYRN.ARAB REPUBLIC	1855	8323	22.3	1.0	33
DOMINICA	1280	10901	11.7	12.8	10
PACIFIC TRUST Territories	1003	1584	63.3	60.2	10
OMAN	901	30317	3.0	0.6	26
BRITISH INDIAN OCEAN territ.	632	677	93.4	96.9	N.A
GIBRALTAR	622	1237	50.3	N.A	N.A
CHRISMAS ISLANDS	548	1428	38.4	0.1	2
NIUE	449	667	67.3	51.0	3
QATAR	440	16606	2.6	0.5	19
FRENCH OCEANIA, n.e.s.	432	602	71.8	N.A	N.A
TONGA	379	2644	14.3	29.8	6
NEW CALEDONIA	366	1556	23.5	10.9	16
MONTSERRAT	347	2593	13.4	93.8	2
COOK ISLANDS	285	504	56.5	45.6	6
LIBERIA	274	536	51.1	7.9	11
U.S.MISC. PACIFIC ISLANDS	272	648	42.0	N.A	N.A
BRUNEI	264	98210	0.3	1.3	14
CAYMAN ISLANDS	211	2022	10.4	48.3	5
HEARD & McDONALD ISLANDS	206	210	98.1	N.A	N.A
IRAQ	203	39116	0.5	0.5	20
GRENADA	184	1688	10.9	4.5	6
GUAM	112	116	96.6	28.0	3
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	105	99506	0.1	0.6	11
PITCAIRN ISLANDS	85	566	15.0	100.0	2
FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)	77	117	65.8	17.7	7
KOREA, D.P.Republic of	68	445	15.3	N.A	N.A
NEW ZEALAND DEPENDENCIES	68	499	13.6	N.A	N.A
TURKS-CAICOS	44	53	83.0	8.0	2
COMMONWEALTH OCEANIA n.e.s.	32	32	100.0	N.A	N.A
MONGOLIA	28	675	4.1	19.4	8
COCOS ISLANDS	26	59	44.1	0.0	N.A
BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS	25	34	73.5	16.0	N.A
AUSTRALIAN territories, n.e.s.	24	760	3.2	N.A	N.A
LEEWARD & WINDWARD ISLANDS	23	333	6.9	N.A	N.A
CONGO	14	14	100.0	2.5	15
NORFOLK ISLANDS	13	676	1.9	31.4	N.A
CAMBODIA	11	21	52.4	20.9	3
AMERICAN SAMOA	9	9	100.0	0.6	N.A
ARCTIC & ANTARCTIC n.e.s.	3	177	1.7	N.A	N.A
COMMONWEALTH ANTILLES n.e.s.	1	1	100.0	N.A	N.A

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)	Share of manuf.& semi-manuf. in exports (per cent)	Number of Manuf. and semi-manuf. products exported
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I. ALL PRODUCTS (continued)					
Least developed countries	622155	1335450	46.6		
BANGLADESH	248496	431655	57.6	39.9	47
HAITI	155292	419520	37.0	75.7	21
NEPAL	36023	68793	52.4	88.9	30
MALAWI	32478	33333	97.4	3.8	6
MAURITANIA	20578	136236	15.1	0.6	8
MOZAMBIQUE	18372	40527	45.0	2.1	5
MYANMAR	18146	25125	72.2	7.9	9
UNITED REP. OF TANZANIA	16448	20723	79.4	6.0	14
MALDIVES	10809	10977	98.5	72.5	4
TOGO	9008	10512	85.7	0.8	10
ETHIOPIA	8567	11544	74.2	4.2	9
DEM.YEMEN	8535	14172	60.2	0.1	7
BURUNDI	8249	8266	99.8	1.1	6
AFGHANISTAN	8201	36390	22.5	38.3	21
GAMBIA	5947	13336	44.6	22.4	8
MALI	4426	7190	61.6	2.7	12
LESOTHO	2461	3363	73.2	24.6	8
NIGER	1304	6208	21.0	2.1	16
VANUATU	1178	1178	100.0	1.7	4
BENIN	1097	2456	44.7	6.7	9
RWANDA	916	1282	71.5	0.2	5
UGANDA	914	1332	68.6	0.7	4
BURKINA FASO	839	990	84.7	3.1	9
SUDAN	761	1614	47.1	7.6	10
BOTSWANA	695	1502	46.3	7.9	7
SIERRA LEONE	580	1420	40.8	1.1	4
SAMOA	419	5078	8.3	31.2	6
GUINEA	261	836	31.2	13.7	8
SOMALIA	241	389	62.0	3.0	12
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	205	266	77.1	3.9	6
COMOROS	200	236	84.7	19.2	4
CHAD	153	153	100.0	7.6	5
GUINEA BISSAU	152	639	23.8	1.4	1
YEMEN	122	2755	4.4	3.7	7
SAO TOME & PRINCIPE	115	474	24.3	8.6	4
BHUTAN	112	224	50.0	43.9	2
DJIBOUTI	99	228	43.4	24.7	5
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	71	202	35.1	2.7	9
LAO PEOPLE'S DEM.REP.	32	414	7.7	30.9	10
CAPE VERDE	11	11	100.0	23.5	4

Source: UNCTAD/GATT magnetic tapes and UNCTAD calculations.

a Austria, Canada, EEC, Finland (1985), Japan, New Zealand (1985), Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States.

b Actual beneficiary countries or territories under each scheme. For the EEC, effective beneficiaries are taken into account (i.e. ACP countries and Mediterranean countries which receive more favourable tariff treatment under special preferential arrangements are excluded). Beneficiaries are ranked according to the importance of value of their exports of excluded products.

IMPORTS INTO DEVELOPED MARKET-ECONOMY COUNTRIES [a] OF PRODUCTS EXCLUDED FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE SCHEMES, FROM INDIVIDUAL BENEFICIARY, 1986 [b]

(Thousands of dollars)

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
II. INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS			
WORLD	192609956	595151837	32.4
Beneficiaries	20543556	67338027	30.5
Beneficiaries (other than least developed countries)	20151695	66518704	30.3 30.3
MEXICO	4122257	10426504	39.5
BRAZIL	2444824	6330450	38.6
MALAYSIA	1615487	2879886	56.1
PHILIPPINES	1173570	2056051	57.1
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF	1181639	8729553	13.5
INDIA	906758	2702754	33.5
CHINA	904433	4754585	19.0
THAILAND	771873	2113305	36.5
INDONESIA	769129	1480911	51.9
HONG KONG	649453	6674227	9.7
TAIWAN, Province of China	487535	2484955	19.6
PAKISTAN	477168	1200842	39.7
ISRAEL	424009	1356682	31.3
VENEZUELA	384229	868545	44.2
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	321042	478610	67.1
TURKEY	317930	465451	68.3
YUGOSLAVIA	299897	891741	33.6
SRI LANKA	296040	433564	68.3
NIGERIA	264169	264187	100.0
MACAU	253076	865625	29.2
ARGENTINA	184162	688416	26.8
COSTA RICA	167512	216154	77.5
SINGAPORE	166817	1762414	9.5
PERU	140706	469067	30.0
IRAN (Islamic Rep.of)	132966	366700	36.3
COLOMBIA	129659	243610	53.2
JAMAICA	125932	134422	93.7
URUGUAY	110138	231705	47.5
BARBADOS	91843	111873	82.1
MAURITIUS	89860	109378	82.2
CHILE	57194	160972	35.5
EL SALVADOR	49339	62058	79.5
ROMANIA	46443	1225619	3.8
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	45855	62647	73.2
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	44333	44973	98.6
EGYPT	40840	65117	62.7
ZIMBABWE	33855	78913	42.9
HONDURAS	33077	53151	62.2
PANAMA	31239	120707	25.9
U.S.VIRGIN ISLANDS	30619	31435	97.4
ANGOLA	29961	29968	100.0
MALTA	27553	51774	53.2
GUATEMALA	26010	35259	73.8
ZAIRE	25904	85510	30.3
BERMUDA	17370	17672	98.3
MOROCCO	15076	38166	39.5
BELIZE	14514	18227	79.6
FIJI	12942	13081	98.9
TUNISIA	12747	22841	55.8
SWAZILAND	10773	14073	76.6
CUBA	10643	18723	56.8
KENYA	10551	24226	43.6

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
II. INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS (continued)			
SAINT LUCIA	9828	10637	92.4
NETHERLANDS ANTILLES	9694	15011	64.6
CYPRUS	8442	13282	63.6
BAHRAIN	7156	91424	7.8
ALGERIA	7194	7456	96.5
SAUDI ARABIA	6070	673690	0.9
BOLIVIA	5793	16174	35.8
BULGARIA	5236	23439	22.3
ANTIGUA BARBUDA	4920	8539	57.6
SURINAME	4229	5774	73.2
GABON	4123	4123	100.0
BAHAMAS	4113	174801	2.4
ECUADOR	4072	13026	31.3
JORDAN	3423	54427	6.3
COTE D'IVOIRE	3338	5920	56.4
TOKELAU	2628	2904	90.5
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	2576	72659	3.5
LEBANON	2447	68507	3.6
ZAMBIA	2391	240946	1.0
MADAGASCAR	2316	3225	71.8
FRENCH POLYNESIA	1993	4797	41.5
SEYCHELLES	1911	3803	50.2
SENEGAL	1888	3995	47.3
ST.VINCENT GRENADA	1808	7334	24.7
PARAGUAY	1451	26131	5.6
GUYANA	1095	1202	91.1
CAMEROON, Republic of	1088	2084	52.2
DOMINICA	1041	7955	13.1
COMMONWEALTH AFRICA n.e.s.	936	2137	43.8
BRITISH INDIAN OCEAN Territ.	632	664	95.2
PACIFIC TRUST Territories	560	978	57.3
SOLOMON ISLANDS	470	509	92.3
FRENCH OCEANIA, n.e.s.	432	602	71.8
QATAR	418	4287	9.8
NIUE	403	614	65.6
VIET NAM	388	5990	6.5
NEW CALEDONIA	366	1442	25.4
MONTSERRAT	343	2490	13.8
GIBRALTAR	332	814	40.8
KUWAIT	319	14979	2.1
TONGA	288	310	92.9
LIBERIA	265	422	62.8
COOK ISLANDS	248	462	53.7
U.S.MISC. PACIFIC ISLANDS	246	249	98.8
CAYMAN ISLANDS	188	1995	9.4
GRENADA	184	1650	11.2
IRAQ	179	35540	0.5
HEARD & McDONALD ISLANDS	164	165	99.4
BRUNEI	163	587	27.8
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	140	1661	8.4
HUNGARY	130	42560	0.3
PITCAIRN ISLANDS	85	310	27.4
OMAN	80	26348	0.3
FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)	77	115	67.0
KOREA, D.P.Republic of	68	445	15.3
GHANA	64	1126	5.7
ST.HELENA	45	574	7.8
TURKS-CAICOS	43	46	93.5
COMMONWEALTH OCEANIA n.e.s.	32	32	100.0
MONGOLIA	28	672	4.2
CHRISTMAS ISLANDS	22	762	2.9
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	17	1814	0.9
CONGO	14	14	100.0
CAMBODIA	10	18	55.6
GUAM	7	10	70.0
NEW ZEALAND DEPENDENCIES	7	381	1.8
LEEWARD & WINDWARD ISLANDS	5	313	1.6
NICARAGUA	1	1827	0.1

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
II. INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS (continued)			
Least developed countries	391866	819976	47.8
BANGLADESH	182118	313833	58.0
HAITI	145885	337431	43.2
NEPAL	34551	66567	51.9
MYANMAR	9254	13931	66.4
MALDIVES	8492	8499	99.9
LESOTHO	2299	3185	72.2
MALI	1498	3071	48.8
NIGER	1291	5518	23.4
MOZAMBIQUE	1037	2750	36.3
SUDAN	735	1135	64.8
MAURITANIA	600	788	76.1
BURKINA FASO	483	613	78.8
BOTSWANA	462	1201	38.5
UGANDA	462	548	84.3
SIERRA LEONE	399	1103	36.2
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA	268	1210	22.1
SOMALIA	240	339	70.8
AFGHANISTAN	200	26169	0.8
COMOROS	200	236	84.7
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	192	192	100.0
MALAWI	180	631	28.5
RWANDA	177	295	60.0
CHAD	153	153	100.0
YEMEN	122	2078	5.9
SAO TOME & PRINCIPE	115	471	24.4
BHUTAN	112	224	50.0
BURUNDI	93	108	86.1
ETHIOPIA	72	82	87.8
GUINEA BISSAU	64	250	25.6
GUINEA	49	223	22.0
DEM.YEMEN	43	1041	4.1
SAMOA	30	45	66.7
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	26	130	20.0
DJIBOUTI	24	153	15.7
CAPE VERDE	11	11	100.0
TOGO	9	188	4.8
BENIN	1	8	12.5

a See part I of this table.
b See part I of this table.

IMPORTS INTO DEVELOPED MARKET-ECONOMY COUNTRIES [a] OF PRODUCTS EXCLUDED FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE SCHEMES, FROM INDIVIDUAL BENEFICIARY IN 1986 [b]

(Thousands of dollars)

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
III. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS			
WORLD	33411400	62202322	53.7
Beneficiaries	10728495	22640588	47.4
Beneficiaries (other than least developed countries)	10498278	22125587	47.4 47.4
THAILAND	1669553	2095908	79.7
TAIWAN, Province of China	1083784	1448376	74.8
CHINA	1009846	1495889	67.5
BRAZIL	905163	2800196	32.3
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF	896455	1295918	69.2
MEXICO	803923	1694943	47.4
INDONESIA	451290	934947	48.3
ARGENTINA	403773	758905	53.2
PHILIPPINES	360515	1029247	35.0
INDIA	336637	553620	60.8
TURKEY	269882	312235	86.4
CHILE	241967	483983	50.0
COLOMBIA	198696	1954045	10.2
CUBA	174336	344342	50.6
MALAYSIA	174198	493262	35.3
COSTA RICA	143638	509723	28.2
ISRAEL	124042	200403	61.9
HONG KONG	97795	132831	73.6
PANAMA	96947	312683	31.0
YUGOSLAVIA	77472	100721	76.9
HONDURAS	76355	291057	26.2
MOROCCO	70507	169716	41.5
GUATEMALA	66791	305420	21.9
VIET NAM	62771	79686	78.8
ROMANIA	57559	92713	62.1
SINGAPORE	51207	95474	53.6
URUGUAY	46336	82679	56.0
ECUADOR	44144	284262	15.5
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	42115	239179	17.6
KENYA	34676	46209	75.0
VENEZUELA	32627	61082	53.4
PAKISTAN	29899	55805	53.6
SRI LANKA	29776	103463	28.8
BULGARIA	25339	32663	77.6
NICARAGUA	25328	147732	17.1
SURINAME	24976	25398	98.3
MADAGASCAR	23226	24507	94.8
ZIMBABWE	22474	29788	75.4
COMMONWEALTH AFRICA n.e.s.	18661	18661	100.0
JAMAICA	18112	50546	35.8
PERU	14811	166017	8.9
PAPUA N.GUINEA	11994	11994	100.0
BELIZE	11377	22999	49.5
SENEGAL	10486	21149	49.6
EL SALVADOR	10073	191811	5.3
HUNGARY	9389	15713	59.8
CYPRUS	8562	13735	62.3
IRAN (Islamic Rep.of)	8240	70281	11.7
GUYANA	7344	18404	39.9
CAMEROON, Republic of	7171	14020	51.1
FIJI	6796	14512	46.8
GHANA	6503	8031	81.0
MAURITIUS	5640	17633	32.0
ZAIRE	5383	5499	97.9
PARAGUAY	5208	48362	10.8
NIGERIA	4438	4466	99.4

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1)/(2) (per cent)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
III. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (continued)			
SPANISH AFRICAN Terr.	3539	3548	99.7
ALGERIA	3434	3464	99.1
LEBANON	3430	4899	70.0
COTE D'IVOIRE	3316	61079	5.4
BARBADOS	3148	5472	57.5
MACAU	2450	4527	54.1
ST.HELENA	2418	2525	95.8
KUWAIT	2367	2913	81.3
SOLOMON ISLANDS	2307	2874	80.3
SYRIAN ARAB REP.	1715	2923	58.7
TUNISIA	1269	5315	23.9
EGYPT	1239	3443	36.0
NETHERLANDS ANTILLES	1162	1806	64.3
BAHAMAS	1091	5319	20.5
OMAN	821	3969	20.7
JORDAN	818	1281	63.9
ST.VINCENT, GRENADA	812	925	87.8
SAUDI ARABIA	648	3206	20.2
BOLIVIA	638	2994	21.3
SWAZILAND	615	12749	4.8
ZAMBIA	535	535	100.0
CHRISTMAS ISLANDS	526	666	79.0
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	505	8867	5.7
ANTIGUA BARBUDA	494	1376	35.9
PACIFIC TRUST Territories	443	583	76.0
GIBRALTAR	290	423	68.6
DOMINICA	239	440	54.3
BERMUDA	104	194	53.6
MALTA	177	273	64.8
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	166	1143	14.5
GUAM	105	106	99.1
SEYCHELLES	103	103	100.0
BRUNEI	101	151	66.9
TOKELAU	95	163	58.3
TONGA	91	2036	4.5
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	88	618	14.2
NEW ZEALAND DEPENDENCIES	61	118	51.7
BAHRAIN	44	126	34.9
NIUE	46	53	86.8
HEARD & McDONALD ISLANDS	42	45	93.3
COOK ISLANDS	37	42	88.1
COCOS ISLANDS	26	53	49.1
U.S.MISC. PACIFIC ISLANDS	26	41	63.4
U.S.VIRGIN ISLANDS	26	26	100.0
BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS	25	25	100.0
AUSTRALIAN territories, n.e.s.	24	37	64.9
IRAQ	24	195	12.3
CAYMAN ISLANDS	23	23	100.0
QATAR	22	76	28.9
LEEWARD & WINDWARD ISLANDS	18	20	90.0
NORFOLK ISLANDS	13	16	81.3
FRENCH POLYNESIA	11	41	26.8
AMERICAN SAMOA	9	9	100.0
LIBERIA	9	101	8.9
MONTSERRAT	4	103	3.9
ARCTIC & ANTARCTIC n.e.s.	3	25	12.0
COMMONWEALTH ANTILLES n.e.s.	1	1	100.0
CAMBODIA	1	1	100.0
TURKS-CAICOS	1	7	14.3

Imports from: [b]	Excluded dutiable imports Value	Total dutiable imports Value	Share (1):(2) (per cent)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
III. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS (continued)			
Least developed countries	230289	515474	44.7
BANGLADESH	66378	116272	57.1
MALAWI	32298	32700	98.8
MAURITANIA	19978	135436	14.8
MOZAMBIQUE	17335	37777	49.0
UNTED REP.OF TANZANIA	16180	17501	92.5
HAITI	9407	77695	12.1
TOGO	8999	9037	99.6
MYANMAR	8892	11155	79.7
ETHIOPIA	8495	11455	74.2
DEM.YEMEN	8492	13131	64.7
BURUNDI	8156	8156	100.0
AFGHANISTAN	8001	9679	82.7
GAMBIA	5947	13336	44.6
MALI	2928	4116	71.1
MALDIVES	2317	2407	96.3
NEPAL	1472	1589	92.6
VANUATU	1178	1178	100.0
BENIN	1096	1438	76.2
RWANDA	739	739	100.0
UGANDA	452	467	96.8
SAMOA	389	4864	8.0
BURKINA FASO	356	361	98.6
BOTSWANA	233	301	77.4
GUINEA	212	241	88.0
SIERRA LEONE	181	181	100.0
LESOTHO	162	178	91.0
GUINEA BISSAU	88	389	22.6
DJIBOUTI	75	75	100.0
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	45	72	62.5
LAO PEOPLE'S DEM.REP.	32	356	9.0
SUDAN	26	233	11.2
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	13	13	100.0
NIGER	13	690	1.9
SOMALIA	1	15	6.7

a See part I of this table.
b See part I of this table.

Table 4

Beneficiaries of the schemes of generalized preferences

As of 30 January 1990

ACP signifies an African, Caribbean or Pacific country signatory to the Lomé Convention.
LDC signifies one of the least developed countries.
MED signifies a Mediterranean country which also enjoys special preferences or special tariff treatment under an Association or other preferential agreement with EEC.

Beneficiary	Preference-giving country															
	Australia	Austria	Bulgaria	Canada	Czechoslovakia	European Economic Community	Finland	Hungary	Japan	New Zealand	Norway	Poland	Sweden	Switzerland	United States of America	USSR a/
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
I. Members of the Group of 77																
Afghanistan (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z		
Algeria (MED)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Angola	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Antigua and Barbuda (ACP)	x	x		x		x	x		x	x	x b/	x	x b/	x	x	
Argentina	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Bahamas (ACP)	x	x		x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	
Bahrain	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x b/	x	x	x		
Bangladesh (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Barbados (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Belize (ACP)	x	x		x		x	x		x	x	x b/	x	x b/	x	x	
Benin (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z b/	z	z b/	z	z	
Bhutan (LDC)	x	z	x	z b/	x	z	z		z	z	z b/	z	z b/	z	z	
Bolivia	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Botswana (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Brazil	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Burkina Faso (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z b/	x	z	z	x	z	z	z b/	z	z	z	z	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
Burundi (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z	z	z	
Cambodia	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x		
Cameroon, Republic of	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Cape Verde (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z		z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Central African Rep. (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	x[b]	
Chad (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z	z	z	
Chile	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[b]	
Colombia	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Comoros (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z			z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Congo (ACP)	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
Costa Rica	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Côte d'Ivoire (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Cuba	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Cyprus (MED)	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	x	x			x		x					x	x	x		
Democratic Yemen (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z		
Djibouti (ACP) (LDC)	x	z		z[c]	x	z	z			z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Dominica (ACP)	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
Dominican Republic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Ecuador	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Egypt (MED)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
El Salvador	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Equatorial Guinea (ACP) (LDC)	x	z		z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Ethiopia (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z		
Fiji (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Gabon (ACP)	x	z	x	x[c]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Gambia (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z[c]	z	z	
Ghana (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Grenada (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
Guatemala	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Guinea (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Guinea-Bissau (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z		z	z	z[c]	z	z	z	z	
Guyana (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Haiti (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Honduras	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
India	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	.7)
Indonesia	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Iran, Islamic Republic of	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Iraq	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c/]	x		
Jamaica (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Jordan (MED)	x	x	x	x[c/]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c/]	x	x	
Kenya (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Kuwait	x	x	x	x[c/]	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x[c/]	x		
Lao People's Democratic Rep. (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c/]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c/]	z	z[c/]	z		
Lebanon (MED)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Lesotho (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z		z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Liberia (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x[c/]	x	x[c/]	x		
Madagascar (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c/]	x	x[c/]	x	x	
Malawi (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Malaysia	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Maldives (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Mali (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c/]	x	z	x	x	z	z	z	z	z[c/]	z	z	
Malta (MED)	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Mauritania (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c/]	x	z	x	x	z	z	z[c/]	z	z[c/]	z	x	
Mauritius (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Mexico	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Morocco (MED)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Mozambique (LDC) (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	z	x	x	z	z	x	x	
Nepal (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Nicaragua	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Niger (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c/]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c/]	z	z[c/]	z	z	
Nigeria (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c/]	x	x	x		
Oman	x	x			x	x	x		x		x[c/]	x	x[c/]	x	x	
Pakistan	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Panama	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x[c/]	x		
Papua New Guinea (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Paraguay	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Peru	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Philippines	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Qatar	x	x	x	x[c/]	x	x	x		x		x[c/]	x	x[c/]	x		
Republic of Korea	x	x		x		x[b/]	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Romania	x	x		x		x	x		x	x	x		x	x		

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
Rwanda (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Saint Lucia (ACP)	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (ACP)	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
St. Kitts and Nevis (ACP)	x	x		x		x			x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
Samoa (ACP) (LDC)	x	z		z[c]		z	z		z	z	z[c]	z	x[c]	z	z	
Sao Tome and Principe (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z		z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Saudi Arabia	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x		
Senegal (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Seychelles (ACP)	x	x		x[c]	x	z	x		x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
Sierra Leone (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	x	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Singapore	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		
Solomon Islands (ACP)	x	x		x[c]	x	x	x		x	x	x[c]	x	x	x	x	
Somalia (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Sri Lanka	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Sudan (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	
Suriname (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Swaziland (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Syrian Arab Republic (MED)	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x[c]	x	x	
Thailand	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Togo (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Tonga (ACP)	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Trinidad and Togago (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Tunisia (MED)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Tuvalu (ACP) (LDC)	x	z		z[c]		z	x		x	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	x	
Uganda (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Union of Myanmar (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	x	z	z	z	z	x[b]	
United Arab Emirates	x	x	x	x[c]	x	x	x		x		x[c]	x	x[c]	x		
Abu Dhabi	x	x											x	x		
Dubai	x	x											x	x		
Ras-al-Khaimah	x	x											x	x		
Fujairah	x	x											x	x		
Ajman	x	x											x	x		
Sharjah	x	x											x	x		
Umm Al Qaiwan	x	x											x	x		
United Republic of Tanzania (ACP) (LDC)	x	z	x	z	x	z	z	x	z	z	z	z	z	z	z	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
Uruguay	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Vanuatu (ACP) (LDC)	x	z		z[c]		x	x		z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	x	x	
Venezuela	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Viet Nam	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Yemen (LDC)[d]	x	z	x	z[c]	x	z	z	x	z	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	z	
Yugoslavia	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	
Zaire (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Zambia (ACP)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Zimbabwe (ACP)	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
II. Other beneficiaries																
Albania	x									x						
Brunei Darussalam (ACP)	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x	x	x[c]	x		
Bulgaria	x	x		x			x		x	x	x		x	x		
China	x	x		x		x	x		x	x	x		x	x		
Hong Kong	x	x		x		x	x		x		x	x	x	x		
Hungary		x	x	x		x			x	x					x	
Israel (MED)	x	x		x			x		x		x		x	x	x	
Kiribati (ACP) (LDC)	x	z		z[c]		z	x		x	z	z[c]	z	z[c]	z	x	
Macao	x	x		x		x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	
Mongolia	x				x		x		x	x		x	x[c]			
Muscat		x											x			
Nauru	x	x		x[c]	x	x	x			x	x[c]		x[c]	x		
Poland			x	x		x			x	x					x	
Taiwan Province of China	x	x							x	x						
Turkey (MED)	x	x		x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

z The preference-giving country which makes provision for special and more favourable treatment for the LDCs.

a/ All developing countries having relations with the USSR are beneficiaries of its scheme.

b/ The country whose beneficiary status was temporarily suspended.

c/ The country which has not yet fulfilled the notification requirements under the relevant scheme.

d/ Consists of Yemen Arab Republic and Yemen Democratic both LDCs.

Dependent or Administered Countries and Territories

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
AUSTRALIA															
Cocos Islands				x[c/]		x				x	x[c/]				x
Christmas Island				x[c/]		x				x	x[c/]				x
Hard Island & McDonald Islands						x					x[c/]				x
Norfolk Island				x[c/]		x				x	x[c/]				x
FRANCE															
Mayotte		x				x					x[c/]			x	
Austral Islands											x[c/]				
French Polynesia	x	x		x[c/]							x[c/]		x[c/]		x
New Caledonia	x	x		x					x		x[c/]		x[c/]	x	x
Wallis and Futuna	x	x								x			x[c/]	x	x
St. Pierre & Miquelon	x	x				x							x[c/]	x	
NETHERLANDS															
Netherlands Antilles	x	x		x		x	x		x		x[c/]		x	x	x
Aruba		x				x									x
NEW ZEALAND															
Cook Islands		x		x					x		x		x	x	x
Tokelau Islands	x	x		x[c/]					x		x[c/]		x	x	x
Niue		x		x[c/]					x		x[c/]		x[c/]	x	x
FRANCE															
Reunion (Adelie Land, Crozet Islands, Kerguelen, New Amsterdam, etc.)															x
French Oceania															x

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
SPAIN															
Canary Islands									x						
Ceuta and Melilla									x						
UNITED KINGDOM															
Gibraltar	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]			x	x
St. Helena & Dependencies	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
British Indian Ocean Territory	x	x		x[c]		x				x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
Anguilla	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x				x	x
Bermuda	x	x		x		x			x		x[c]		x[c]	x	
Cayman Islands	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
Falkland Islands (Malvinas)	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
Monserrat	x	x		x					x	x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
Turks & Caicos Islands	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
British Virgin Islands	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]		x[c]	x	x
Pitcairn	x	x		x[c]						x	x[c]		x[c]		x
British Oceania														x	
UNITED STATES															
Virgin Islands American	x	x		x		x			x		x[c]		x[c]	x	
American Samoa	x			x[c]		x			x		x[c]		x	x	
Guam	x	x		x[c]		x			x	x	x[c]		x		
Johnston & Sand Islands	x	x				x					x[c]		x[c]	x	
Midway Islands	x	x				x					x[c]		x[c]	x	
Wake Islands	x	x				x					x[c]		x[c]	x	
United States Territories in the Pacific Ocean										x	x[c]			x	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
United States Trust Territory	x	x				x			x	x			x[c/]		
The Carolines				x[c/]		x			x		x[c/]				
Micronesia															x
Palau														x	x
Marianas				x[c/]		x			x		x[c/]			x	
Marshall Islands				x[c/]		x			x		x[c/]				x
Greenland						x			x						x
Western Sahara	x														x
<u>Polar regions</u>															
French Southern and Antarctic Territories				x[c/]		x					x[c/]		x[c/]		
Australian Antarctic Territories						x									
British Antarctic Territories						x								x	

UNITED
NATIONS

TD

United Nations Conference
on Trade and Development

Distr.
GENERAL

TD/B/C.5/131
21 May 1990

Original: ENGLISH

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD
Special Committee on Preferences
Seventeenth session
Geneva, 14 May 1990

REPORT OF THE BUREAU ON CREDENTIALS

In accordance with rule 17 of the rules of procedure of the Main Committees of the Trade and Development Board, which is applicable to the Special Committee on Preferences, the credentials of all the representatives attending the seventeenth session of the Committee were examined in a meeting of the Bureau which recommended that they be accepted.

GE.90-51415/6347A